

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6958 of 2017

=====

Shubham Kumar, Son of Ram Pukar Sharma, resident of Mohalla- Madhukar Colony, Sri Krishna Nagar (Ahri), Aurangabad, P.S. and District- Aurangabad (Bihar).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board (S.S.), Budh Marg, Patna.
3. The Principal, Kadri Inter School, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Verma, Adv.

For the Respondent No.2 : Mrs. Anjum Parween, Adv.

For the Respondent No.3 : Mr. Rajendra Singh, Adv.

Mrs. Malti Kumari, Adv.

For the State : Mrs. Abhanjalli, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 04-09-2017

The petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents to reevaluate his Chemistry practical paper of Senior Secondary Examination, held in the year 2016. It is the grievance of the petitioner that though he had appeared in all papers including practical paper in the subject Chemistry, however, he has been shown to be absent in practical



examination in Chemistry.

2. The petitioner had appeared as student of Rajkiyakrit Bhikshan Singh +2 School, Bahuriya Bigha, Barun, Aurangabad. It appears that the petitioner was required to appear for the practical examination in Kadri Inter Vidyalaya, Daudnagar, Aurangabad.

3. Counter affidavits have been filed on behalf of the Bihar School Examination Board (*in short 'Board'*) and the Principal of the said Kadri Inter School, Daudnagar, Aurangabad.

4. It is the stand of the Board in the counter affidavit that the Board did not receive the marks allotted to the petitioner in practical examination. It is the stand of respondent No. 3, the Principal of Kadri Inter School, Daudnagar, Aurangabad, that all related documents had already been submitted to the District Education Officer, containing attendance-sheet of the examinees.

5. The petitioner has not said in the application as to where he had appeared for said practical examination.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances, as noted above, no relief can be granted by issuing writ of mandamus, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

8. Rejection of the present writ application will not



restrain the petitioner from taking recourse to other remedies including by way of filing suit before a Court of competent jurisdiction.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	25.09.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

