

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4659 of 2015

- =====
1. Jai Kumar Yadav, son of Parmeshwar Yadav, resident of Village-Bijalpura, P.O.- Loha, P.S.- Arera, District- Madhubani, State- Bihar.
 2. Ranjan Kumar, son of Sitaram Singh, resident of Jitwarpur Railway Colony, House No. 165/J, P.O.+ P.S.+District- Samastipur, State-Bihar.
 3. Rajesh Kumar Yadav, son of Parmeshwar Yadav, resident of Village-Bijalpura, P.O.-Loha, P.S.- Arera, District- Madhubani, State-Bihar.
 4. Shiv Bachan Yadav, son of Ramjee Rai, resident of Mohalla-Jitwarpur Railway Colony, House No.182(E), P.S. + P.O.+District-Samastipur, State-Bihar.
 5. Raushan Vatsa, son of Dharendra Jha, resident of Village-Narayanpatti, P.O-Narayanpatti, P.S. Rajnagar, District-Madhubani, State-Bihar.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna(Bihar).
2. The Principal Secretary, Ministry of Home, Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
3. The Directorate General of Police (D.G.P.), Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
4. The Secretary, General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
5. Inspector General (I.G.) Operation, Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
6. Inspector General (I.G.), Economic Offence Unit-3, Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
7. Inspector General (I.G.), S.T.F., Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
8. Superintendent of Police (S.P.), S.T.F., Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
9. Superintendent of Police, (S.P) Cum Chairman, S.T.F. Selection Board, Govt. of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. R.N. DUBEY- AAG12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 01-05-2015

01.05.2015

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioners were applicants to be appointed as Dog Handler under the respondents. The parameters, which have been laid down by the Board, petitioners did not beget the minimum qualifying marks. For that matter, nobody got the minimum qualifying marks. Therefore, appointments never came to be made. Petitioners

decided to file a writ application, alleging many a things.

In the counter affidavit, the details of the procedure and process adopted have been talked about. The performance of the petitioners has been talked about. The offer of the respondents to the petitioners to come and verify their own answer-sheet to see things for themselves has also been brought on record, which the petitioners never responded.

If the Court does not find anything amiss or there is nothing to show that there was deliberate kind of mischief played in the process of selection or the respondents were trying to play hide and seek or not willing to come clean, there could have been an occasion for this Court to give direction on the claim of petitioners for appointment. But in absence of such materials and the facts being what they are, failed candidates naturally cannot be given a direction to be appointed, violating the yardstick and minimum benchmark, which was fixed by the Board in this regard.

Writ application stands dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J.)

SKM/-

U			
---	--	--	--