

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17249 of 2018

1. Most. Shanti Devi, aged about 76 years, Wife of Late Daroga Singh, Resident of Village- Shekhpura, P.S.- Amnour, District- Saran at present residing with her son in law namely Ajit Kumar Singh, at Mohalla- Fair Field Colony, P.S.- Digha Danapur, District- Patna.
2. Ajit Kumar Singh, Son of Late Chandrama Prasad @ Late Chandrama Prasad Singh, Resident of Village- Sadhpur Chattar, Post- Soniya, P.S.- Daudpur, District- Saran at present residing at Mohalla- Fair Field Colony, P.S.- Digha Danapur, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Home Commissioner, Department of Home, State of Bihar, Patna.
3. Director General of Police (D.G.P.), Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. Director General of Police (D.G.P.) and Inspector General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. Deputy General of Police (Head Quarter), Bihar, Patna.
6. Assistant Inspector General of Police (Welfare), Police Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
7. Deputy Inspector General of Police (Inspection), Police Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
8. Deputy Inspector General of Police, (Human Rights), Police Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
9. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Tirhut Region, Muzaffarpur.
10. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Saran Region, Chapra.
11. Inspector General of Police (Head Quarter), Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
12. Inspector General of Police (Administration), Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
13. Superintendent of Police, Saran (Chapra).
14. Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar Sinha, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Md. Harun Quareshi AC to SC-01



CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 03-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The writ application has been filed in August, 2018 for quashing the order dated 07-01-2003, passed by the Superintendent of Police, Saran, Chapra, as contained in Annexure-11 to the writ petition, terminating the service of petitioner No.2.

3. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of Respondent No.14. At the very outset, learned counsel for the State, has raised the issue of the instant writ petition being barred by delay and laches and it is submitted that the writ petition has been filed 15 years after the order of dismissal was passed.

4. This Court would find that there is also no explanation whatsoever for this inordinate delay in approaching the writ Court. The writ petition is thus fit to be dismissed on this ground alone, in view of decision of the Apex Court in the case of ***Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply & Sewerage Board & Ors. Vs. T.T. Murali Babu*** reported in ***(2014) 4 SCC 108***.

5. This Court, therefore, finds that the petitioner is not



entitled to any relief under the equitable writ jurisdiction of this Court on the ground of delay and laches. For the reasons indicated hereinabove, the writ application is dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

