

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12401 of 2022

1. Kumar Pawan Prasad Das Son of Krishana Devi Das, Resident of Village-Ekdara, P.S. and Block-Khajauli, District-Madhubani.
2. Shiv Kumar Das Son of Gangaram Das Resident of Village- Khajauli, P.S.-Khajauli, District-Madhubani.
3. Baidyanath Kumar Basuki Son of Maheshwar Prasad Yadav Resident of Kishan Bhawan Road, P.S.-Jaynagar, District-Madhubani.
4. Awadhesh Kumar Son of Jibachh Yadav Resident of Village-Biraul, P.S.-Pandaul, District-Madhubani.
5. Md. Sanaullah Ansari Son of Abdul Jabbar, Resident of Village-Quaziyahi, P.S.-Khajauli, District-Madhubani.
6. Kameshar Singh Son of Dhanbir Singh Resident of Village-Marukiya, P.S.-Khajauli, District-Madhubani.
7. Ram Praksh Singh Son of Chanchal Singh Resident of Village-Inarwa, P.S.-Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani.
8. Saroj Kumar Son of Uttam Lal Prasad Resident of Village-Biraul, P.S.-Pandaul, District-Madhubani.
9. Anwarul Haque, Son of Abdul Ohid, Resident of Village- Sukki Dih Tola, P.S.-Khajauli, District-Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Madhubani, District Madhubani.
4. The Block Development Officer-Cum-Charge Officer, Khajauli Block, District Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Subhash Kumar Jha, Adv.
For the State : Ms. Namrata Singh, AC to GA-12

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

- 3 04-01-2023 1. The petitioner states that he was appointed as an Enumerator regarding Socio-Economic and Caste Census 2011 for the period from 15.03.2012 to 20.04.2012 and prays that he



should be paid the remuneration for the said period including travelling allowance. The writ petition has been preferred after a period of ten years. No plausible explanation has been put forward by the petitioner for not approaching this Court earlier for such a claim. There is no document to show that the petitioner has ever claimed the said amount soon after performing his duties in 2012. The representation is also of dated 18th July 2022 alone. Thus, it is found to be a case of gross laches on part of the petitioner. In fact, they never claimed for the amount for almost ten years and have for the first time raised the issue. Disputed questions of fact cannot be examined after such a long delay.

2. The writ petition is dismissed on the ground of gross laches and delay.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Sachin/-
Item No. 18

U			
---	--	--	--

