

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Letters Patent Appeal No.772 of 2014
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 20755 of 2012**

=====

Subhash Tanti son of Late Jago Tanti, resident of village- Madanpur, P.O.-
Kachahari Shampur, P.S.- Haweli Kharagpur, District- Munger

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Chief Secretary, Human Resources Department, Government of Bihar,
Patna
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Chairman, Zila Saksharta Samittee, Munger
4. The District Programme Officer (Saksharta)-cum-Secretary, Zila Lok Shiksha
Chayan Samittee, Munger
5. The Chairman, Zila Parishad-cum-Zila Lok Shiksha chayan Samittee, Munger
6. The Block Education Officer, Haweli Kharagpur, District- Munger
7. The Pramukh, Prakhand Lok Shiksha Chayan Samittee, Haweli Kharagpur,
District- Munger
8. The Mukhiya, Panchayat Lok Shiksha Chayan Samittee, P.S. Haweli
Kharagpur, Agrahan, District- Munger
9. The Headmaster, Middle School, Agrahan, P.S.- Haweli Kharagpur, District-
Munger
10. Rajesh Kumar Rai son of Krishna Kumar Rai, resident of village- Bageshwari,
P.O.- Kachahari Shampur, District- Munger

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Narsingh Tanti, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kameshwar Kumar, GP-17
Mr. Amit Bhushan, AC to GP-17

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 23-03-2017

Seeking exception to an order dated 28.3.2014 passed
by the learned Writ Court in C.W.J.C. No.20755 of 2012 this appeal
has been filed under Clause-10 of the Letters Patent.

2. Petitioner was selected for appointment on the post



of Senior Co-ordinator, but on a complaint made by one Rajesh Kumar Rai, respondent No.10, the matter was looked into and, as is evident from Annexures-A and B to the counter affidavit filed by the respondent No.4, thereafter on enquiry it was found that the petitioner has received less marks than respondent No.10. There was some interpolation in the experience certificate and, as this was found to be correct, the appointment of the petitioner was cancelled.

3. Learned Writ Court, finding certain omission and commission in the matter of granting appointment, found no error in the cancellation of the appointment of the petitioner and dismissed the writ petition.

4. We have considered the submissions made in the counter affidavit, not only in this proceedings, but also in the writ petition and the findings recorded in the enquiry reports (Annexures-A and B), we find no reason to interfere into the matter.

The appeal is dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	28.03.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

