

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8528 of 2018

Abhijeet Kumar S/o Dilip Kumar, resident of Nawaratan Hata, P.S. K.Hat,
Sahayak District Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department having his office at Old Secretariat, P.S. Sachivalaya, District Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar having his office at Vikas Bhawan, P.S. Sachivalaya, Patna.
3. The Director Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar having his office at Vikas Bhawan, P.S. Sachivalaya, District Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Purnea having his office at Collectorate Compound, Purnea.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, District Board, Purnea.
6. The District Education Officer, Purnea.
7. The Programme Officer Establishment, Purnea.
8. The Member District Appellate Authority, Purnea.
9. The Regional Deputy Director, Purnea.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vikas Mohan, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Amit Bhushan, AC to GP-17

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH
SHARMA**

ORAL ORDER

2 23-08-2022 Heard the parties.

The petitioner assails the order passed by the District Appellate Authority dated 21.04.2015, whereby the Appellate Authority dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner on the



ground of delay. He further submits that he should be treated as qualified for counselling for the post of Hindi teacher in the light of notification issued on 24.08.2017 as he has passed the degree of Sahitya Alankar prior to 07.05.2012, and therefore, the same should be treated as equivalent to graduation.

I have carefully considered the submissions.

I find that the petitioner applied for the post of Hindi teacher for which counselling was conducted between 26th December, 2008 to 30th December, 2008. The petitioner did not participate in the counselling. He submitted a representation to the authority that he should be called for counselling but was not called allegedly on the ground that he did not possess the qualification. He did not challenge the said action till he preferred an appeal before the District Appellate Authority in 2014. The District Appellate Authority rejected his claim on the ground of delay and laches. Where after he did not take up the matter in any court and has preferred the writ petition after four years before this court in 2018. Thus, it is a case of gross casualness and laches on part of the petitioner. This court would refrain from going into the merits of the case, in such circumstances, where the petitioner himself is not aware of his rights and has slept over his claim for a long period.



The writ petition is wholly frivolous and is accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

amit/-
Item no.6

U			
---	--	--	--

