

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13371 of 2015

=====

Surendra Prasad son of Parmanand Prasad, Resident of village- Ram Nagar,
Post- Radhaganj, P.S.- Bhorey, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar,
Patna
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Deputy Director, Secondary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna
5. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Saran at Chapra
6. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj
7. The District Education Officer, Gopalganj
8. The District Programme Officer (Establishment) Gopalganj
9. The Block Education Officer, Bhorey, District- Gopalganj
10. The Selection Committee Jila Parishad, Senior Secondary, Teachers
Appointment 2008, through the Chief Executive Officer, Jila Parishad,
Gopalganj.
11. The Chief Executive Officer, Jila Parishad, Gopalganj

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey No-5, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Narendra Kumar, AC to GA-20
For the Zila-Parishad, Gopalganj	:	Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Pandey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

7 16-05-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel

for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of

the Zila-Parishad, Gopalganj.



Having participated in a process of selection for selection of Librarians and Senior Secondary Teachers, in the year 2006-07, writ application has been filed in the year 2015, alleging that the petitioner was the 4th person in the select list/merit list, prepared in the process of selection. Three (3) persons placed above him in the merit list, have not joined and, therefore, he should be offered appointment to the post in-question.

A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent No. 8. Paragraph No. 07 of the counter affidavit reads as follows:-

“That it is not in dispute that 1st the phase of Panchayat Teachers employment, 2006 concluded in the year employment, 2007 itself and all vacancies were carried forward for the next phase of Panchayat Teacher appointment 2008 which was also concluded in the month of December, 2010 with specific direction that no employment shall be made after 31.12.2010 and all seats shall be carried forward for the next phase of selection”

The petitioner however contends that the process did not conclude, but in fact had been aborted, which in the opinion of this Court does not improve the claim of the petitioner.

In view of the above facts, as also the long delay and



latches on the part of the petitioner, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the writ application is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

Raj kishore/-

U			
---	--	--	--

