

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Letters Patent Appeal No.1971 of 2015**

**In**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12338 of 2015**

=====

Ratan Kumar @ Ratan Kumar Sinha, S/o Sri Prabhat Kumar @ Prabhat Kumar Sinha, resident of village- Block Road, Ward No. 1, P.S.- Thakurganj, District- Kishanganj.

... .. Petitioner-Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Home Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Jail and Reforms Services Inspectorate, Home Department, Bihar, Patna. null null
3. The Bihar Karamchari Chayan Aayog through its Secretary, Veterinary College, Patna- 14

... .. Respondents-Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                     |   |                                  |
|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For the Appellant/s | : | Mr. Mukesh Kumar Jha, Advocate   |
| For the State       | : | Mrs. Archana Prasad, AC to SC 19 |
|                     |   | Mr. Saurabh Kumar, AC to SC 19   |
| For the Commission  | : | Mr. S. S. Sundaram, Advocate     |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

**Date : 04-09-2017**

Petitioner was a candidate, who had applied for appointment on the post of Warden in pursuance to an advertisement issued in the year 2013. When the petitioner was called for participating in the selection process, it was found that in the certificate issued for various courses, the name of the petitioner and his father showed variance. In the certificate of education, the name of the petitioner was shown as 'Ratan Kumar son of Prabhat Kumar' and in the certificate of training produced by him, the name was shown as



‘Ratan Kumar Sinha, son of Prabhat Kumar Sinha’ and finding there to be variation in the name and holding the training certificate of the petitioner is not acceptable, his candidature has been rejected. The learned Writ Court has also refused to interfere into the matter.

If the petitioner feels the petitioner is the same person in whose favour certificate of training has been issued, he should have got the certificate corrected and produced the corrected certificate before the concerned authority. This having not been done, finding, variation in the name of the petitioner and his father, the authorities have rejected his candidature, we see no reason to interfere into the matter. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

**(Rajendra Menon, CJ)**

**( Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)**

Sunil/-

|                          |            |
|--------------------------|------------|
| <b>AFR/NAFR</b>          | NAFR       |
| <b>CAV DATE</b>          | NA         |
| <b>Uploading Date</b>    | 07.09.2017 |
| <b>Transmission Date</b> |            |

