

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2927 of 2017

-
-
1. Jay Bansh Kumar Ram, Son of Sri Yogendra Ram, Resident of village - Majhaura, P.S. Laukaha, Distt. - Madhubani
 2. Jiwachh Mochi, Son of Sri Awadh Mochi, Resident of village - Narayan Patti, P.S. Raj Nagar, Distt. - Madhubani
 3. Jagdish Safi, Son of Late Laxmi Safi, Resident of village - Laufa, P.S. Lakhnour, Distt. Madhubani
 4. Masheshwar Ram, Son of Late Mushan Ram, Resident of village - Marraoua, P.S. Laukahi, Distt. - Madhubani
 5. Rama Shankar Paswan, Son of Late Ram Lakhan Paswan, Resident of village-Kashyard, P.S. Raj Nagar, Distt. - Madhubani
 6. Pramod Paswan, Son of Sri Suttu Paswan, Resident of village - Sohraul, P.S. Benipatti, Distt. - Madhubani
 7. Ajab Lal Paswan, Son of Chuthar Paswan, Resident of village - Dulli Patti, P.S. Jay Nagar, Distt. - Madhubani
 8. Rajdeo Paswan, Son of Mouje Paswan, Resident of village - Betaunha, P.S. Jay Nagar, Distt. - Madhubani
 9. Sobhit Sadai, Son of Mouje Sadai, resident of village - Narar Than Tole, P.S. Kaluahi, Distt. - Madhubani
 10. Ram Narayan Ram, Son of Sri Lal Ram, Resident of village - Hari Raha, P.S. Andhra Math, Distt. Madhubani

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Commission-cum-Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Directorate of Panchayati Raj
4. The District Magistrate, Madhubani
5. The District Panchayat Officer, Madhubani
6. The Block Development officer, Distt. Madhubani

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Patanjali Rishi, A.C. to AAG-6

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 24-09-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and

learned counsel for the State.



In this case, the petitioners are challenging the order containing memo no.164 dated 09.02.1998, by which the service of the petitioners has been dispensed with holding that their appointment is illegal.

The petitioners are challenging the order of 1998 after two decades without explaining the delay. Only the ground has been taken that recently the order has been passed in different writ petitions and after that the present writ petition has been filed. A person who is sitting outside the fence cannot be allowed to participate after the result is declared within the ring.

In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in this writ petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

pawan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

