

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SIKKIM

ORDER SHEET

Writ Petition (C) No. 17 of 199 2002

N. K. Pradhan Petitioner/Appellant

Versus

State of Sikkim & Others Respondent

Serial No. of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order
1.	12.12.2002	Present : Mr. B. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.	
		Mr. S. P. Wangdi, Advocate General with Mr. J. B. Pradhan, Government Advocate for the respondents.	
		Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner on	
		admission.	
		The petition has been carelessly drafted and it does not	
		make any sense. In paragraph 3 of the petition it has been	
		stated that the petitioner was promoted to the post of Assistant	
		Engineer along with the other petitioners on 12.04.1999 and it	
		is incomprehensible as to what is the meaning of "other	
		petitioners". In relief (d) it states "a writ or direction to the	
		respondent or each of the respondents to consider the seniority	
		of the petitioner and include their names in the final seniority	
		list after quashing Annexure P-4 and inserting the name of the	
		petitioner and other 8 incumbents similarly circumstanced in	
		appropriate place in the final seniority list". Learned counsel	
		for the petitioner is unable to say what is the meaning of "other	
		8 incumbents". The order of promotion has also not been	•
	! !	annexed with the petition. One of the reliefs claimed is that the	
		petitioner should be promoted with retrospective effect from	
		the year 1993 or 1996 but he has admitted that he has already	
		been promoted with effect from 12.04.1999. There is nothing	
		to show why the petitioner should not have sought promotion	
İ		in the year 1993 or 1994 itself, if he ought to have been	
		promoted in the year 1993. Since the petition does not make	
		any sense, the same is dismissed in limine. However, this will	

not bar fresh petition on the same cause of action.

N · Gwyd (R. Dayal) Chief Justice 12.12.2002