

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Letters Patent Appeal No.858 of 2017**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10154 of 2003**

=====

Lalan Giri, Son of Sir Narpati Puri, resident of Chandpur Belia, P.O. & P.S.-  
Jakkanpur, District- Patna.

... .. Appellant

Versus

1. The Union of India through the ministry of Labour, New Delhi.
2. The Desk Officer, Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
3. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Patna.
4. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Mauryalok Complex, Patna.
5. The Management of the State Bank of India through its Chairman, S.B.I.,  
Administrative Building, Madam Kama Road, Mumbai.
6. The Chief General Manager, S.B.I., Local Head Office, J.C. Road, Patna.
7. The Branch Manager, S.B.I., Main Branch, Patna.

... .. Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : None  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Tiwary, CGC

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN**  
**and**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

**(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN)**

5     27-11-2018                      Today is the second consecutive date when none appears on behalf of the appellant-writ petitioner to press the interlocutory application filed for condonation of delay of 6 years and 102 days. This fact stands discussed in the order passed on 26.11.2018 and the prayer of the appellant-writ petitioner for reference of his dispute under Section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’) stood rejected by the appropriate authority under ‘the Act’ as back as on 12.05.1999 and which order was never challenged by



him. The said order having attained finality that on a second attempt a similar rejection came on 16.08.2001. This appellant again questioned the rejection through the writ petition in question and which again has been rejected taking note of the past events as well as the fact that the retrenchment took place in 1984.

In the circumstances noted, we are certainly not persuaded to condone the delay of 6 years and 102 days consumed in filing of the present appeal and as a consequence I.A. No. 9419/2017 filed for condonation of delay is rejected and in the nature of the discussion made above as well as the fact that the limitation petition has been rejected, L.P.A. No. 858/2017 is dismissed accordingly.

**(Jyoti Saran, J)**

**( Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

Surendra/  
Archana

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

