

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3423 of 2026

Prabhu Prasad Nag S/O Indrasan Prasad Nag, Resident of Village- Jura Pakri,
P.S.- Ramnagar, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Principal Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Govt. of Bihar.
2. The Accountant General, Govt. of Bihar.
3. The Senior Account Officer, Officer of Accountant General, Patna, Bihar.
4. The District Magistrate, West Champaran (Bettiah).
5. The District Treasury Officer, West Champaran (Bettiah).
6. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, West Champaran (Bettiah).
7. The Block Development Officer Ramnagar, West Champaran (Bettiah).
8. The Block Development Officer, Chanpatiya, West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Kaushal Kishor, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. K.P.Gupta, GP 10
		Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Satya Vrat, AC to GP 10
		Mr. Pravin Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 13-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has filed the instant application
for the following reliefs:

*“1. For direction to respondent authority for
Treatment of Seniority to be given to the
petitioner from 1995 as to junior to petitioner
who were working as a dalpati made as
Panchayat Secretary rather petitioner were
given said benefit only in 2003.*



II. For direction to respondent authority to make payment of salary between 1995 to 2003 in the scale of Panchayat Secretary rather than Dal Pati.

III. For direction to respondent for any other reliefs for which petitioner may found entitled, fit and proper for want of justice.”

3. It is the case of the petitioner that having been appointed as Dalpati, he started working in the said capacity. Not having been promoted to the post of Panchayat Secretary inspite of the policy decision of the State Government, the petitioner moved this Court vide CWJC no.1641 of 1998 which was disposed of by order dated 8.9.1999 (Annexure-P/1) directing the District Magistrate to consider the case of the petitioner expeditiously.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that pursuant to the directions passed by this Court, the case of the petitioner was considered by the District Selection Committee which led to the petitioner being made Panchayat Sachiv in October, 2003.

5. The grievance of the petitioner is that persons junior to the petitioner as Dalpati having been made Panchayat Sachiv earlier to this petitioner, as such he moved this Court by way of writ application for the reliefs as stated hereinabove.



6. At the outset, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the writ application is fit to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches itself, there being no explanation for not having moved this Court earlier in the year 2003.

7. This Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the respondents.

8. It may be observed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Surjeet Singh Sahni versus State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors.; (2022) 15 SCC 536** has observed that filing of representation does not extend the limitation and the person aggrieved has to approach this Court within a reasonable time.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused contents of the petition, the Court is satisfied that the case is fit to be dismissed on ground of delay and laches.

10. The writ application and the same is dismissed.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Bibhash

U			
---	--	--	--

