

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11536 of 2012

=====

Suraj Kumar, Son of Bhagwan Das, R/O Dhobibigha, P.S. Asthawan, District-Nalanda. Petitioner.

Versus

1. The Union of India through Ministry of Railway Recruitment Board, Kolkata.
 2. The Chairman, Railway Recruitment Board, Kolkata.
 3. The Member Secretary, Railway Recruitment Board, Kolkata.
 4. The Assistant Secretary, Railway Recruitment Board, Kolkata.
- Respondents.
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None
For the Respondents : Mr. Anil Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

And

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)

Date: 01-04-2016

The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 21.01.2011 passed in O.A. No.843 of 2010 by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna Bench, Patna, by which the Original Application of the petitioner has been rejected on lack of territorial jurisdiction.

In spite of repeated calls no one appears for the petitioner. Heard Mr. Anil Singh, learned counsel for the Railways.

The petitioner had applied against an advertisement issued by the Eastern Railway from Kolkata for recruitment on certain posts that were notified in the advertisement. The application to be filed in Kolkata and the

- 2 -

entire examination was held at Kolkata. Before results could be published, enquiries revealed that allegedly the petitioner himself had not appeared in the written examination and it was a case of impersonation. The expert opinion in regard to the handwriting was taken, which was against the petitioner. Notice had been issued from Kolkata to the petitioner and the petitioner just made a flat denial. The petitioner was debarred from the selection process as per the advertisement and further debarred from all future examinations of the Eastern Railways. It is this order that the petitioner challenged before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna Bench, Patna.

In view of the facts as noted above and in view of the findings of the expert about the impersonation as also the fact that the advertisement was of the year 2005 and we are in the year 2016, we do not think it to be an appropriate case in which we should interfere.

Accordingly, the writ application is dismissed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.)

(Nilu Agrawal, J.)

Trivedi/-

U			
---	--	--	--