



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19107 of 2025

Shankar Kumar Jha S/o Kedar Nath Jha, Resident of village- Kayastha Kabai,
P.O.- Raghopur Dyodhi, P.S.- Manigachi, District- Dharbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar.
2. The Director, Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Vice Chancellor, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Kameshwar Nagar, Darbhanga.
4. The Registrar, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Kameshwar Nagar, Darbhanga.
5. The Principal, Jagdishnandan Mahavidyala, Madhubani, a constituent unit of L.N. Mithila University, Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Shashi Bhushan Singh
For the L.N.M.U.	:	Mr. Bindhyachal Rai, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Prashant Pratap, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the University.

2. In the present writ application, the petitioner has prayed for grant of following relief :-

(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the letter No. VCR 1789/07 dated 25.11.2007 by which the claim of the petitioner to be regularised has been rejected without going through the facts of the claim of the petitioner as well as law laid down by the Hon'ble Court as the petitioner was appointed following the due process of appointment procedure.

(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent authorities to regularise the services of the





petitioner as he has been appointed following the procedure as Lab. Assistant (department of Psychology) in a college namely Jagdishnandan Mahavidyala, Madhubani with all monetary benefits including arrears of salary as well as current salary, whereas many similarly situated person and some juniors who appointed after the petitioner have been regularised and getting their salary smoothly and the process of regularisation of the petitioner is under process which is evident from letter No. 1405 dated 10.08 2016 issued by the Public Information officer of the University.'

3. From the relief claimed by the petitioner, it is apparent that the petitioner is challenging the order dated 25.11.2007 by which the claim of the petitioner for regularisation was rejected. As against the same, this writ application is being filed after 18 years. When specific query was asked to learned counsel for the petitioner that as to why the petitioner has approached this Court so belatedly, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to explain the delay to the satisfaction of this Court. A sleeping litigant has no remedy in law and particularly when the delay in filing the writ application has not been explained.

4. In such view of the matter, the present writ application is dismissed on account of delay and laches.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

