

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1389 of 2016
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19173 of 2012

=====

Ratnesh Kumar Singh Son of Late Shiv Dayal Singh resident of Village-
Madhurapur, P.S. Biddupur, District- Vaishali

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Health, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director in Chief, Health Services, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Regional Deputy Director, Health Services, Tithut Division, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Vaishali at Hajipur
5. The Additional Chief Medical Officer, Vaishali at Hajipur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr.Shiv Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Mandal, SC-3
		Mr. Bipin Kumar AC to SC-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

6 22-07-2025 **Re: I.A. No. 02 of 2025**

Heard I.A. No. 02 of 2025 for condonation of delay.

There is a delay of about 419 days in filing L.P.A. No. 1389 of
2016.

2. Delay of about 419 days in filing L.P.A. No.1389 of
2016 has not been appropriately explained. Paragraph nos. 3, 4
and 5 read as under:-

“3. That during the pendency of the connected
writ petition the appellant attained the age of



superannuation on 30.11.2012.

4. That after attaining the age of superannuation, the appellant moved to Hosiyarpur, Punjab for search of some private job for survival of his family members as due to termination of his service, his entire source of income was dried up. He had no other source of income for survival of his family members. He and his entire family was suffering from great adversities. They were deprived of source of sustenance.

5. That when the appellant returned back for Hosiyarpur in June 2016 and contacted his learned counsel regarding status of the writ petition filed by him, then only he was informed that his case has already been dismissed by the learned single judge on 03.04.2015 itself.”

3. Sufficient cause has not been shown so as to condone the delay of about 419 days in filing LPA No. 1389 of 2016.

4. Accordingly, I.A. No. 02 of 2025 stands dismissed.

LPA No. 1389 of 2016.

5. Resultantly LPA No. 1389 of 2016 stands dismissed.

6. Pending I.A., if any, stands disposed of.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(S. B. Pd. Singh, J)

ranjan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

