

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12891 of 2022

=====

Dhananjay Kumar Son of Brij Nandan Sharma Resident of Village- Mushepur
Khaira, P.S. Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad, PIN- 824143.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through The Secretary, -cum- Industrial Development Commissioner, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Handloom and Sericulture, Department of Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Managing Director, Bihar State Handloom and Handicraft Corporation Limited, Udhyog Bhawan, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ram Shankar Kumar, Advocate
		Ms. Shruti Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Subhash Pd. Singh (GP-3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 29-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondent authorities to regularize the services of the petitioner, to pay his arrears for the work done in the Handloom and Handicraft Corporation Limited at Paliganj (Patna), and further, to pay other consequential benefits arising out of his services.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that the present writ petition is not maintainable due to the inordinate delay on the part of the petitioner in approaching this Court. Counsel further submits that it has been categorically stated in paragraph 12 of the petition that the petitioner worked for some time in Paliganj unit of the corporation itself but without any



emolument. As such, the petitioner was left with no option but to leave the services of the corporation.

4. In response thereto, counsel for the petitioner further submits that a similarly situated person had moved before this Court in the year 2010 seeking regularization and payment of salary, and an order was passed in his favour on 26.03.2010. Therefore, the petitioner has moved before this Court for consideration of his case.

5. Upon hearing the parties and perusal of the relevant documents, it transpires to this Court that the cause of action for the petitioner arose in the year 2010, particularly when a similarly situated person was granted benefits. However, the petitioner moved before this Court only in the year 2022, i.e., after a lapse of about 11 years. It is further evident that at the time of filing the writ petition, the petitioner was 59 years of age, and he is now about 62 years old. As such, no relief can be granted to him.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

