

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9463 of 2016

=====

Smt. Reeta Devi Wife of Sri Umakant Singh resident of Village:- Shamho (Sarlahi)
P.O:-S S Barari, P.S.: Shamho, District:- Begusarai, Pin Code:- 811106.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Chairman, Bihar Staff Selection Commission, P.O:- Veterinary College, Patna 800014.
3. The Secretary, Bihar Staff Selection Commission, P.O:- Veterinary College, Patna 800014.
4. The District Magistrate, Begusarai.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sanjeet Kumar Singh, AC to AAG-6
For B.S.S.C. : Mr. Kamla Kant Upadhyay

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 10-03-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner prays for an appropriate direction to the authorities concerned for reconsideration of the marks allotted to her on experience gained while working as Auxiliary Nurse-Mid Wifery.

The grievance of the petitioner is that she participated in the selection process initiated by the Bihar Staff Selection Commission vide Advertisement present at Annexure 1 and in reference to the qualification present, it is the submission of the learned counsel that five marks for each year of experience gained, was to be given to the candidates and which has not been properly computed in the case of the petitioner. Learned counsel has referred to the experience



certificates present at Annexures 4 series to support his stand and submits in reference to the score card present at Annexure 5 that the marks granted under academic and experience qualification, is not correct.

Although time was granted to the Staff Selection Commission to seek instructions and which have not been forthcoming but I am not persuaded to grant any further time rather I am of the opinion that the matter can be sorted out here and on the basis of documents on record.

The experience certificate relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner enclosed at Annexures 4 series would show that most of them do not give the period of experience. Though the certificates had mentioned that the petitioner has worked but while the certificate at Page-28 simply mentions the year, there is no mention on the certificate present at Page-30. Similar goes with the certificate at Page-32. In such vagueness existing where the exact period of the work done by the petitioner is not properly reflecting from the certificates, the score card grants the petitioner no less than 20 marks as against the experience because the remaining marks is for the educational qualification. In my opinion, unless the petitioner would be able to support her claim for higher marks by showing that she had worked for five completed years to gain 25 marks, and which is



apparently missing in the present case and the score card present at Annexure 5 also qualifies the petitioner in the selection, no case for indulgence is made out.

The writ petition is disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Surendra/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	21.03.2017
Transmission Date	NA

