

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16224 of 2015

=====

1. Kanchan Kumari daughter of Satyendra Prasad @ Satyendra Narayan Singh,
resident of village - Umarai Bigaha, P.O. Shaistabad, P.S. Ghosi District -
Jehanabad

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar New Secretariat, Patna
2. The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar New Secretariat, Patna
3. The Director General of Police Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna
4. The I.G. (Administration) Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna
5. The Secretary Home (Police), Department of Home (Police), Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna
6. The Central Selection Board Council (Police Recruitment), I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna 801503 through its Secretary
7. The Chairman Central Selection Board Council (Police Recruitment), Bihar Patna I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna 801503
8. The Secretary Central Selection Board Council (Police Recruitment), I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna 801503

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Md. Anis Akhtar
For the Respondent State: Mr. Asit Kumar Jha, AC to GP6
For the C.S.B.C. : Mr. Sanjay Pandey
Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra
Mr. Vivek Anand Amitesh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 22-04-2016

The issue raised by the petitioner that her claim for appointment as a constable ought not to be rejected because of some mis-match in the name of the father is not entertainable by the Court. This Court had occasion to deal with such matter even earlier and after detailed consideration had also passed order that indulgence is not required to be given to such candidates keeping in mind that they

have failed to carry out the clear direction issued in the advertisement especially since there was an object and purpose behind it.

The past experience of the Central Selection Board for Constables made them wiser and that is why instruction was given in the advertisement since many candidates by minor change in their name or father’s name made applications at more than one place for such selection. Obviously, they do not want the computer to throw up the same name at more than one place giving them lesser opportunity for consideration.

If the petitioner has made a mistake as is being urged, the mistake will cost her appointment. There are hundreds of such people who have deliberately done such mischief. The Court refuses to give indulgence to any of such candidate in the above given facts. The Court will not make an exception even with regard to this petitioner by interfering with Annexure – 8 dated 02/09/2015.

Writ application is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

R.K.Pathak/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	22/04/2016
Transmission Date	