

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1635 of 2026

=====

Lokesh Kumar Verma @ Lokesh Verma @ Lokesh Kumar Son of Late
Ramswaroop Prasad, Resident of C1, Flat No. 21, Samarth Nagar, Wadgaon
Sheri, Temo Chowk, P.S. and District-Pune.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Magadh University, Bodh Gaya through its Registrar.
2. The Vice-Chancellor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
3. The Registrar, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
4. The Principal Ram Lakhan Singh Yadav College, Aurangabad.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Saroj Kumar, Advocate
For Magadh University : Mr. Siddhartha Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the Magadh University.

2. The petitioner in the present writ application has
prayed for the grant of following reliefs:-

(i) For the issuance of a writ of mandamus, and/or,
any other appropriate writ/direction/order commanding the
respondents to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground
on class-III post, as his father, who was a teacher in a
constituent college (RLSY College, Aurangabad), died in
harness on 13.08.2013.

(ii) For the issuance of appropriate
writ/direction/order to ensure all consequential relief to the



petitioner in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the Respondent-University submits that this writ application ought to be dismissed on account of delay and laches for the reason that the cause of action arose in the year 2013 but he has filed this writ application in the year 2026 after a delay of almost 13 years for which there is no sufficient explanation given in the writ application.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in paragraph-8, the petitioner has given explanation for the delay. Paragraph-8 of the writ application is quoted hereinbelow for needful :-

“8. That the petitioner pursued his case for compassionate appointment by calling upon the respondent authorities several times between 2013 and 2025. However the respondents ignored the prevent request of the petitioner in this regard.”

5. In support of the statement made in paragraph-8 of the writ application, no material/document has been enclosed with the writ application and only bald statement has been made.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances stated above,



this Court is not inclined to entertain the present writ application. It is accordingly dismissed for delay and laches.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

