

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11231 of 2014

=====

Jay Prakash Singh son of Bhagwati Singh Resident of village - Sonhar, P.S. Sheo Sagar, District - Rohtas (Sasaram).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Home Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Shahabad Range, Dehri-on-sone, Rohtas.
4. The Chairman, Constable Selection Board No.2, Buxar.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Kaimur, Bhabhua.
6. The Chairman, Constable Selection Board, Kaimur Bhabhua through Superintendent of Police, Kaimur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar Choubey, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Amresh Kumar Sinha, GA8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 06-12-2017

Heard counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner had applied for appointment as constable pursuant to Advertisement No. 1 of 2004. He has placed on record the fact that he has been found ineligible. He disputes that the marks awarded to him are inaccurate and that he has not been awarded marks on certain parameters. The recruitment process under the said advertisement has already been closed.

Counsel for the petitioner relies upon the order passed in LPA No. 831 of 2009 and other analogous cases. From perusal of the



said order, it appears that whatever directions or observations have been made therein are in respect of the selected candidates pursuant to the earlier recruitment process. As the petitioner admittedly is not a selected candidate, he is not covered by the observations and direction passed in the said LPA.

Since new selection process of 2009 has been referred in the said LPA and the petitioner was an applicant in the selection process of 2004 and had filed the writ petition in 2014 challenging his non- selection in 2004 i.e., 10 years after having participated in the selection process, the petitioner has no claim, the same is barred by delay and latches also.

The writ petition is misconceived and dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

Prakash/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	12.12.2017
Transmission Date	

