

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

WP(C) No.293 of 2026

Smt. Shikha Sarkar, aged 43 years,
Wife of Late Ratan Sarkar,
Resident of village: Maharanipur,
P.O.: Chakmaghat, P.S.: Teliamura,
District: Khowai, Tripura.

---- Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Tripura,
Represented by the Secretary,
in the Department of Health Services,
Government of Tripura, Secretariat,
New Capital Complex-799010,
Agartala, Tripura.

2. The Director of Health Services,
Government of Tripura, P.N. Complex,
Gurkhabasti, P.O.:Agartala: 799006, Tripura.

3. The Sub-Divisional Medical Officer,
Teliamura, P.S. & P.O.: Teliamura,
District: Khowai, Tripura.

----Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Dilip Kumar Das Chawdhury, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Karnajit De, Addl. GA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT

Order

04/05/2026

Learned Counsel, Mr. Dilip Kumar Das Chawdhury is present on behalf of the petitioner.

It is the case of the petitioner that in the year 2016, the petitioner was engaged by the office of respondent No.3 as Sweeping and Cleaning Assistant on monthly remuneration of Rs.6000/-. Thereafter, by an office order dated 29.07.2020 she was dismissed from the service on the ground of negligence of duty without affording her any opportunity.

Learned Addl. GA, Mr. Karnajit De appearing on behalf of the respondents-State submitted that there is no cause of action in this writ

petition as there is no document from the side of the petitioner to establish the fact that the petitioner was engaged by the respondent No.3 and furthermore, it was also submitted that since her discharge from service i.e. from the year 2020 to 2026, no step was taken by the petitioner seeking redress. As such, this petition is also not maintainable on the ground of delay and laches.

I have perused the writ petition along with the documents annexed thereto. Excepting one representation made in the year 2026, there is no other document lying with the record to consider the case of the petitioner. Furthermore, Learned Counsel at the time of hearing also failed to satisfy this Court to exercise its jurisdiction under Article 226 to address the grievance of the petitioner. As such, I do not find any scope to entertain this writ petition.

Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed being devoid of merit.

JUDGE

