

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.349 of 2022
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3730 of 2021

=====

Shashi Kumar Singh Son of Late Nunu Prasad Singh, resident of Village and P.O.-Rahuamani, Near School, Ward No. 04, Bangaon, P.S.-Bangaon, District-Saharsa.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of General Administration, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of General Administration, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
4. The Deputy Collector, Establishment Saharsa.
5. The Deputy Collector, Nazarat, District-Saharsa.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Saharsa, Sub-Division, District-Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Dr. Anand Kumar, A.C. to AAG-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

4 24-06-2025

Re : I.A. No. 01 of 2022

The learned Advocate for the appellant/applicant presses I.A. No. 01 of 2022 for condoning the delay of 131 days in preferring this appeal.

2. For the reasons stated in the application, the delay of 131 days in preferring this appeal is condoned.

3. I.A. No. 01 of 2022 stands allowed.

Re : L.P.A. No.349 of 2022

4. The appellant has challenged the judgment dated



31.01.2022 passed in CWJC No.3730 of 2021 whereby his prayer for a direction to the authorities to include his name in the panel for being regularized as a Peon has been rejected.

5. The claim of the petitioner rests on his expectation of the upper age relaxation in his case as the same was allowed in the case of *Naresh Tiwari vs. The State of Bihar & Ors. (CWJC No.8591 of 2007)* disposed of on 15.03.2012.

6. On perusal of the order dated 15.03.2012, we find that the case of Naresh Tiwari was conditional and the direction was issued in his favour for his name to be included in the panel only if he had not crossed the age of superannuation.

7. The petitioner as on date is 67 years of age.

8. There is thus no merit in this appeal.

9. The appeal is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, ACJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/Rajesh

U			
---	--	--	--

