

13.02.2025
Item No.1
RP/SM
Ct. No.01

WPCR/26268/2006
in
WPA/17851/2006

KALYANI TALTA B.R. AMBEDKAR UNNYAN SANSTHA
VS.
THE STATE

Mr. Amitava Choudhuri, Adv.
Ms. Monoleena Chaudhuri, Adv.
Mr. N. Roy, Adv.

....For the Respondent Nos.2 & 3

1. This Public Interest Litigation has been filed in the year 2006 praying for issuance of writ of mandamus to direct the respondent nos.2 and 3 to rescind and/or cancel and/or withdraw the impugned notification dated 11th November, 2005. The said notification was issued by the respondent-university wherein applications were invited to fill up the vacancies as mentioned in the enclosure to the notice from eligible candidates having requisite qualification and documents in prescribed format which was made available in the office of the Registrar of the university from 14th November, 2005 to 23rd November, 2005. The writ petition was initially heard on 11th August, 2006 and the respondent-university was directed to file their affidavit-in-opposition within a time frame. The petitioner was also directed to file a supplementary affidavit. Subsequently on 17th November, 2006 a Rule was issued in the writ petition.

As could be seen from the endorsement made by the Assistant Registrar, the writ petitioner has not taken steps to file the requisites to enable notice to be sent to the respondents. Subsequently, direction was issued on 30th March, 2007 to take steps to complete the service. The same was complied with and a notice has been served.

2. Learned advocate appearing for the respondents submitted that the notification dated 11th November, 2005 was given effect to and selection was made in the year 2006 and several of the selected candidates have attained the age of superannuation and retired from service or on the verge of retirement. As on date the challenge to the impugned notification has become infructuous as the filling up of the vacancy has already been completed and no steps have been taken by the petitioner to move the writ petition.
3. Therefore, we find no reason to keep the writ petition pending any longer. In the result, the same is dismissed and the Rule stands discharged.

(T.S. SIVAGNANAM)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(BIVAS PATTANAYAK, J.)