

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17518 of 2021

- =====
1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
 2. The Chief Executive Officer, Prasad Bharti (Broadcasting Corporation of India), PTI Building, 2nd Floor, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi 110001.
 3. The Director General, Doordarshan Bhawan, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi.
 4. The Deputy Director of Administration, Directorate of Doordarshan, Doordarshan Bhawan, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi.
 5. The Director, Doordarshan Kendra Patna.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

Rajesh Tiwari Son of Sri Brijnandan Tiwary, resident of Village Narhi, P.O. Narhi, Chandi, District - Bhojpur.

... .. Respondent

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anshuman Singh, CGC

For the Respondent/s: Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN)

Date : 03-11-2021

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners has filed an undertaking to remove all defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter as and when required. It is accordingly directed that all defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter be removed within one month hereof.

2. The present writ petition has been filed "*for setting aside the final order dated 02.12.2019 passed in O.A./050/00582/2016 whereby and whereunder the learned Central*



Administrative Tribunal, Patna has quashed Office Order dated 03.09.2014 and 20.07.2015 by which request of the Respondent for regularization to the Post of Librarian/Library and Information Assistant was denied."

3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna has erred in quashing the impugned orders having regard to the cases of other persons said to be similarly placed and who did not also have the requisite qualification at the time of initial engagement but they have been regularized subsequently. It is submitted that those persons had acquired requisite qualification within ten years of their initial engagement, unlike the petitioners who acquired his qualification much beyond the initial ten years since engagement.

4. On being requested, however, learned counsel for the petitioners was unable to show that any specific plea has been taken in the writ petition in this regard. Moreover, reference to paragraph-17 of the writ petition does not also indicate that the other such persons who had been regularized had acquired their requisite qualification within ten years of their respective initial appointments.

5. We also take note that the present writ petition has been filed after considerable delay in September, 2021 questioning the order of the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna dated 02.12.2019, i.e. after a delay of almost one year and ten



months without explaining the reasons for the delay. No pleading has been pointed out in the writ petition in this regard.

6. The petitioners have therefore not made out a case for interference with the impugned order of the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna passed in O.A./050/00582/2016 dated 02.12.2019.

7. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

8. Office shall follow-up to ensure that all defects are removed and compliance with the notices of this Court are made by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Ibrar//-

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	03.11.2021
Transmission Date	N.A.

