

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.235 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11749 of 2013

=====

Motiur Rahman Ansari, aged about 62 years (Male), Son of Late Mohammad Siddique Ansari, Resident of Village- Akhtiyarpur, Post Office and Police Station- Garkha, District- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, the Science and Technology Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Secretary, the Science and Technology Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Bihar Public Service Commission, through its Chairman, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.
7. The Deputy Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.
8. Sri Ravindra Lal, Son of Lakhan Lal, Resident of Village- Nijamuddinpur, Post Office and Police Station and District- Jehanabad.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Shiyaram Sahi, Advocate and Mr. Md. Amir Alam, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, A.A.G.-5, Mr. Md. Kamil Akhtar, A.C. to A.A.G.-5 and Mr. Alok Ranjan, A.C. to A.A.G.-5.
For the Pvt. O.P.	:	Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)

5 02-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

Re.: Interlocutory Application No. 01 of 2026:



2. The present Interlocutory Application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 06 years 03 months and 28 days in preferring the present Civil Review No. 235 of 2024.

3. Upon consideration of the grounds stated in the application, we find that no cogent, convincing, or justifiable explanation has been furnished for such prolonged delay. At this juncture, it is pertinent to take note of the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court while deciding the case of ***Basawaraj V. Land Acquisition Officer***, reported in ***(2013)14 SCC 81***, wherein it was observed as follows:

“15. The law on the issue can be summarised to the effect that where a case has been presented in the court beyond limitation, the applicant has to explain the court as to what was the “sufficient cause” which means an adequate and enough reason which prevented him to approach the court within limitation. In case a party is found to be negligent, or for want of bona fide on his part in the facts and circumstances of the case, or found to have not acted diligently or remained inactive, there cannot be a justified ground to condone the delay. No court could be justified in condoning such an inordinate delay by imposing any condition whatsoever. The application is to be decided only within



the parameters laid down by this Court in regard to the condonation of delay. In case there was no sufficient cause to prevent a litigant to approach the court on time condoning the delay without any justification, putting any condition whatsoever, amounts to passing an order in violation of the statutory provisions and it tantamounts to showing utter disregard to the legislature.”

4. Accordingly, Interlocutory Application No. 01 of 2026 stands dismissed.

Re.: Civil Review No. 235 of 2024:

5. Consequently, the Civil Review is also dismissed.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

U.K./-

U			
---	--	--	--

