

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 7410 of 2018**

Sakram Sahu S/o Nanhuram Sahu Aged About 56 Years Retired Unskilled Labour, R/o Village And Post Dansara, Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Public Works Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Accountant General Treasury Account And Pension Raipur, Division Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Superintending Engineer Public Works Department Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Executive Engineer P. W. D. Raigarh, Division, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer Public Works Department Sarangarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

**---Respondents**

|                     |   |                                |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For Petitioner      | : | Mr. Manoj Jaiswal, Advocate    |
| For State           | : | Mr. R.N. Pusty, Govt. Advocate |
| For Respondent No.2 | : | Mr. Ashwini Shukla, Advocate   |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**13/11/2018**

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking for quashment of Annexure P/1 and P/2 dated 30.10.2010 and 11.10.2012 respectively.
2. The dispute raised by the petitioner is the erroneous date of birth, which has been entered in the service book. According to the petitioner his actual date of birth is 12.08.1962, however inadvertently in the service book the date of birth has been mentioned as 05.03.1951. The petitioner in accordance with the date of birth entered in the service book stood retired on 31.03.2013.

3. Perusal of the record would show that while the petitioner was in service itself, his representation for correction of date of birth was rejected on 30.10.2010. It was again reiterated vide Annexure P/2 on 11.10.2012. In spite of this the petitioner did not challenge the two orders at the appropriate stage, while he was in service and the present writ petition has been filed after more than 5 ½ years from the date of retirement and about 8 years from the date his first representation was rejected.
4. Given the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the firm opinion that the present writ petition suffers from inordinate delay and laches and the same deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-  
**(P. Sam Koshy)**  
**Judge**

Ved