

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17926 of 2017

- =====
1. Manoj Kumar @ Manoj Kumar Ram, son of Late Manu Ram, resident of Mohalla- Adalatganj, Amarnath Road, P.O. G.P.O, P.S. Kotwali, District & Township of Patna.
 2. Anil Kmar, son of Late Navrangi Lal, resident of Danapur Takiapar, P.S. Digha, District- Patna.
 3. Shailendra Kumar, son of Late Rameshwara Paswan, resident of Village- Manjhauli, P.O. Anda, P.S. Phulwarisharif, District- Patna.
 4. Ram Sewak Ram, son of Raghunanda, resident of Village- Murgimchak (Kothvi), P.S.- Khagaul, District- Patna.
 5. Shyam Deo Prasad, son of Late Ram Chandra Ram, resident of Salimpur Ahra, Chanmari Tola Gali, District- Patna.
 6. Sushila Devi, wife of Late Mukhdeo Ram, resident of Mohalla- Kankarbag, Ashok Nagar, Road No. 11, P.S. Kankarbagh, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Department of Telecommunication, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Chief General Manager, Telecommunication, Bihar Circle, Telecom Bhawan, Patna.
3. The Chief General Manager (Administration), Telecommunication, Bihar Circle, Telecom Bhawan, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer (Civil), Civil Division, Telecom Bhawan, Patna.
5. The Executive Engineer, Civil Division, Telecom Bhawan, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

Appearance :



For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar No. 1, Adv.

For the Union of India : Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar, C.G.C.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

Date: 11-01-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and counsel for the Union of India, Department of Telecommunication.

The last of the period of work of these six petitioners with BSNL is shown till July, 1996. They were casual Safaiwala.

The Tribunal, therefore, has rightly refused to pass any order on an O.A. filed in 2017 for a direction to grant temporary status or regularise the service of these petitioners at a such belated time and claim. Further they do not fulfill the parameters required for such consideration. Such stale claim is not required to be entertained.

Before parting, counsel for the petitioners submits that there is instance of discrimination practiced by the respondents. Some persons, who had been engaged after the present petitioners, have been regularized and these petitioners have been left out.

The said submission still does not enthuse this Court to



interfere with the decision of the Tribunal since the reasons for which the O.A. has been dismissed are cogent grounds.

Writ is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

(Nilu Agrawal, J)

Rajesh/Devendra

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	15.01.2018
Transmission Date	NA

