

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.994 of 2022

=====

Sapna Devi, Wife of Vinay Kumar Singh, Resident of Village and P.O. -
Sasamusa, P.S. - Kuchaikot, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme (I.C.D.S.), Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Boring Canal Road, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Saran Division, Chapra.
5. The District Magistrate - cum- Collector, Gopalganj.
6. The District Programme Officer, (I.C.D.S.), Gopalganj.
7. The Child Development Project Officer (C.D.P.O.), Block - Kuchaikot, District- Gopalganj.
8. Anjali Devi Wife of Sri Kamlesh Kumar Singh, Resident of Village and P.O. - Sasamusa, P.S. - Kuchaikot, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Upendra Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S.K.Mandal, SC 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 14-10-2022 Today being Friday, matters are being taken up

through virtual mode, as per current procedure for hearing.

The writ application has been filed assailing order dated 18.09.2012 passed in Aanganwari Appeal Case No. 24/2012 by the District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Gopalganj as well as the appellate order passed by the Commissioner, Saran Division, in Aanganwari Appeal No.341 of 2012. The order of the Commissioner is dated 20.02.2013.



Against this order, writ application has been filed nine years later and there is no averment as to why such delay has occurred.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the Commissioner by impugned order dated 20.02.2013 has rejected the appeal on the ground of delay, the Court should remit the matter to the Court of Commissioner for consideration on merits.

The above noted facts make out a gross case of delay and laches on the part of the petitioner. This Court is not inclined to exercise jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner to revive a stale claim by remitting the matter to the Commissioner, nine years after the impugned order was passed.

Writ petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shashank/-

U			
---	--	--	--

