

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15881 of 2025

Chitranjan Prasad Son of Late Shyam Nandan Prasad, Resident of Village Barhi, P.S. Harlakhi (Umgaon), District Madhubani, at present posted as Departmental Public Grievance Redressal Officer, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Principal Secretary, Industries Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Udyog Bhawan, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
6. The Executive Director- Operation (then Secretary) Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Udyog Bhawan, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, G.P.-14
For the BIADA	:	Mrs. Binita Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI
ORAL ORDER

2 18-11-2025 None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The learned Advocate on behalf of the State-respondents has raised a preliminary objection alleging, inter alia, that the petitioner has filed the instant writ petition praying for the following reliefs:-

(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ for quashing/setting aside the resolution of the General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna



contained in Memo No. 3473, dated 04.03.2015 by which the petitioner has been inflicted upon the punishment of Censor.

(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ for quashing/setting aside the resolution of the General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna contained in Memo No. 6532, dated 07.05.2015 by which the memorial/review petition of the petitioner has been dismissed and punishment of censor was approved.

3. It is submitted by the learned Advocate on behalf of the State-respondents that the order of punishment of censor following a disciplinary proceeding was passed on 4th March, 2015 and the order in the memorial/review petition affirming the order of disciplinary proceeding was passed on 7th May, 2015. After a lapse of more than ten years, the petitioner has approached this Court challenging the said order.

4. It is further submitted by the learned Advocate on behalf of the State-respondents that the instant writ petition is not maintainable on the principle-delay defeats equity. In support of his contention, he refers to a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Delhi Administration & Ors. V***



Kaushilya Thakur & Anr. reported in ***(2012) 5 SCC 412***,
Paragraphs 10 and 11 are relevant for our purpose and is quoted
below:-

10) We have heard Shri H.P. Raval, learned Additional Solicitor General and Shri Rishikesh, learned counsel for Respondent 1 and perused the record. In our view, the impugned order as also the one passed by the learned Single Judge are liable to be set aside because while granting relief to the husband of Respondent 1, the learned Single Judge overlooked the fact that the writ petition had been filed after almost 4 years of the rejection of an application for allotment of 1000 sq yd plot made by Ranjodh Kumar Thakur. The fact that the writ petitioner made further representations could not be made a ground for ignoring the delay of more than 3 years, more so because in the subsequent communication the authorities concerned had merely indicated that the decision contained in the first letter would stand.

11) It is trite to say that in exercise of the power under Article 226 of the Constitution, the High Court cannot entertain belated claims unless the petitioner offers tangible explanation (State of M.P. v. Bhailal



Bhai).

5. Relying on the above-mentioned decision of the Hon'ble Supreme court, this Court concurs with the view submitted by the learned Advocate for the State-respondents.

6. Moreover, the learned Advocate for the petitioner is also found absent.

7. Considering the such aspects of the matter, the instant writ petition is dismissed.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J.)

Jyoti Kumari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

