





No. of Order	of Order	Order with Signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order
6.	12.3.08	<p>Present: Mr. A.Moulik, Sr. Advocate with Mr. N.G. Sherpa, Advocate for the Petitioner.</p> <p>Mr. J.B. Pradhan and Mr. Karma Thinlay, Government Advocates for the Respondents</p> <p>...</p> <p>The writ petition is taken up for consideration of its admission. Heard both sides. The State has filed a preliminary objection as to the maintainability of the writ petition. The State correctly points out that on the last occasion the learned counsel for the petitioner incorrectly submitted on behalf of the petitioner that she would be over age in May, 2008. The Annexure R-1 to the objection shows that for Government servants like writ petitioner the maximum age limit shall be relaxed upto 40 and the writ petitioner is only 34. The writ petitioner appeared at an examination for being selected as Assistant Engineer since she had been unable to obtain promotion to that post. This was in or about December 2006. She did</p>	



No. of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order
		<p>not succeed. As a counter blast to her failure she filed this writ petition in 2007 seeking to reopen the appointment, promotion, deputation and work-charge employments of several respondents. In our opinion the writ Court is not there for the ventilation of the grudges of unsuccessful examinees. This writ petition does not deserve entertainment. It is summarily dismissed.</p> <div> (A.N. Ray, CJ)</div> <div> (A.P. Subba, J)</div>	