

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4646 of 2023

=====

Kumari Gudia @ Gudia Devi D/o Shri Ram Bihari Prasad, Resident of Village-Maheshpur, P.O.-D.K. Shikarpur, Block-Narkatiyaganj, P.S.-Shikarpur, District-West Champaran, At present W/o-Ravi Kumar Verma, R/o Block Road, Narkatiyaganj, P.S.-Shikarpur, District-West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources, Patna (Bihar).
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Patna, Bihar.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Patna, Bihar.
4. The District Magistrate, Bettiah, West Champaran.
5. The District Superintendent of Education, Bettiah, West Champaran.
6. The District Programme Officer (Establishment) Bettiah, West Champaran.
7. The District Education Officer, Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran.
8. The Block Education Officer, Gonaha, West Champaran.
9. The Panchayat Secretary of Gram Panchayat Belwa-cum-Panchayat Mukhiya namely Gopi Yadav Block-Gonaha, P.O.-Belwa, P.S.-Gonaha, District-West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binod Kumar Pandey
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Madan Jeet Kumar (GP 20)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-02-2024 Petitioner claims to have participated in the selection process for Panchayat Teacher in the year 2008 and according to the petitioner the Appointment Committee *vide* Memo No.6 dated 14.08.2010 selected the petitioner and she was directed to submit her educational certificates as well as experience certificate at Primary School, Muniya Tola. When the petitioner went to the Primary School for joining as Panchayat



Teacher, the Secretary of the Gram Panchayat did not accept joining and asked the petitioner to come again on the next date but since then, the petitioner has not been appointed.

2. It is not disputed that the petitioner did not take any step for the last 13 to 14 years for her appointment since 2010.

3. However, learned counsel for the State submits that a case before District Appellate Authority was lodged by the petitioner but the petitioner did not pursue the same.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he kept on filing the representations.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner came to this Court after a lapse of 13 to 14 years and mere filing representation does not explain the delay. Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed on account of delay and laches.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

