

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7885 of 2022

=====

Sulekha Devi, Wife of Late Kishori Paswan, Resident of Village-Lagma, P.O.-
Chourgaon, P.S.-Asarganj District-Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secreary, Home Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Adduitional Director General Of Police (Rail), Bihar, Patna.
4. The Deputy Inspector Genral of Police P (Rail), Bihar, Patna.
5. The Superintendent of Police (Rail), Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Harun Quereshi, AC to SC-01

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 03-04-2025 Heard the parties.

2. This matter was taken up on 14.11.2024 wherein this Court had taken note of the fact that the husband of the petitioner was inflicted with the punishment of removal vide order contained in memo no. 348 dated 03.03.2014, that order was put to challenge by her husband in a duly preferred appeal, which came to be rejected vide order contained in memo no. 304 dated 16.12.2016, but the same has never been challenged by the husband of the petitioner and finally the husband of the petitioner died in the year 2019.

3. It was the contention of the learned Advocate for



the petitioner that since the husband of the petitioner was under depression, thus, he did not challenge the order. In the aforesaid premise, this Court for the ends of justice had allowed the learned Advocate for the petitioner to bring on record some of the prescription of the doctor, in support of his contention that the husband of the petitioner had been suffering from ailment. The matter was further taken up on 21.11.2024 and thereafter on 12.12.2024 but, till date, no such affidavit has been filed, bringing on record the medical prescription of the doctor to support the contention of the petitioner.

4. Considering the fact that the husband of the petitioner had not chosen to challenge the order passed by the appellate authority as contained in memo no. 304 dated 16.12.2016 for a pretty long time of more than four years, this Court does not find any reason to entertain the writ petition duly filed by the wife of the erstwhile employee.

5. Accordingly the present writ petition stands closed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

