

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16842 of 2023

=====

Santosh Singh @ Santosh Kumar Singh S/o Sadhu Saran Singh Resident of
Village-Kataka Khanpur. P.O.-Dwarikaganj, District- Sultanpur, Uttar
Pradesh.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through its Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Education Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Project Director, Bihar Education Project Council, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Rohtas, Sasaram.
5. The District Magistrate, Rohtas, Sasaram.
6. The District Programming Officer, Primary Education and Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, Rohtas (Sasaram).
7. The Block Education Officer, Sanjhauli, Rohtas (Sasaram).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nagendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Kr. Roy 1 (Sc13)
For the BEPC	:	Mr. Girijesh Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Akash Anand, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

3 22-07-2025 Heard Mr. Nagendra Kumar learned counsel for the

petitioner, Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy learned counsel for the State

and Mr. Girijesh Kumar learned counsel for the Bihar Education

Project Council.

2. The petitioner had approached this Court by filing a

CWJC No. 3697 of 2021 challenging the termination of the

petitioner's services as Block Teacher.

3. The aforesaid writ petition was disposed off by an

order dated 24.03.2022 directing the District Appellate

Authority/State Appellate Authority to take up the appeal that may be preferred by the petitioner and decide the matter preferably within a period of three months.

4. Pursuant thereto on an appeal preferred by the petitioner, the State Appellate Authority in O.A. No. 141 of 2022 by an order dated 20.07.2022 has dismissed the appeal preferred by the petitioner stating that the same is time barred.

5. The petitioner in paragraph No. 9 of the writ petition has made a statement that the petitioner's service was terminated by a letter No. IE-1362 dated 24.09.2016 with effect from 10.07.2014.

6. Though the petitioner's services was terminated on the date mentioned above, the petitioner without approaching the concerned Appellate Authority had filed a writ petition before this Court being CWJC No. 3697 of 2021 in the year 2021 which is more than five years from the date the order of termination was issued, whereafter on the direction passed by this Court in the aforesaid writ petition, the State Appellate Authority by the impugned order dated 20.07.2022, passed in O.A. No. 141 of 2022 has dismissed the appeal preferred by the petitioner as time barred.

7. The State Appellate Authority in the aforesaid order

has recorded the finding that though the petitioner has filed an application for condonation of delay, but the petitioner has failed to reasonably explain the delay in preferring the appeal from the year 2016 except the oral submission of the learned counsel representing the appellant/petitioner that the appellant/petitioner was ill during the period.

8. Having perused the impugned order dated 20.07.2022 passed by the State Appellate Authority in O.A. No. 141 of 2022 as discussed hereinabove, I do not find any legal infirmity in the order of the State Appellate Authority and accordingly the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Nishant/-

U			
---	--	--	--