

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.244 of 2015

- =====
1. Shakti Kumar son of Rajdev Prasad Sharma, Resident of village- Belsar, P.O. Nailly, Police Station- Noorsarai, District- Nalanda
 2. Anil Kumar Singh son of Late Hirday Narayan Singh, Resident of village- Maksudpur, P.O. Basatpur Bangla, Police Station- Amnour, District- Saran (Chapra)
 3. Bhanu Ram son of Ram Soorat Ram, Resident of village- Tarma, P.O.- Karmnasa, P.S.- Durgawati, District- Bhabhua (Kaimur)
 4. Tanu Priya daughter of Shambhu Prasad Singh wife of Chandan Kumar, Resident of village- Hasan Chak Bangra, P.O. Purushottampur, Police Station- Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur
 5. Kalpana Kumari daughter of Prem Nath Singh wife of Babbu Jee, resident of Mohalla- Mithanpura, P.O. Ramna, District- Muzaffarpur
 6. Sushma Kumari daughter of Bharat Prasad Sharma, wife of Narendra Kumar, Resident of village- Hasan Chak Bangra, P.O. Purushottampur, Police Station- Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur
 7. Sarita Kumari daughter of Harinandan Prasad, wife of Vinod Kumar, Resident of village- Gonar Bigha, P.O. Bhatta, Police Station- Kashichak, District- Nawada
 8. Khushboo Kumari daughter of Ajay Chaudhary wife of Hari Om Sharan, Resident of village- Aganagar, P.O. Purushottampur, P.S. Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur
 9. Birmani Kumar son of Sitaram Yadav, resident of Mohalla- Khandakper, P.O. Biharsharif, P.S. Biharsharif, District- Nalanda
 10. Sunita Gupta daughter of Hari Prasad Gupta, wife of Birendra Kumar Gupta resident of Mohalla- Brahamasthan, Murarupur, P.O. Biharsharif, P.S. Laheri, District Nalanda

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Primary cum Upper Primary/Secondary Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The Bihar School Examination Board, Patna through its Secretary
5. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suman Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to SC-20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 19-01-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned



AC to SC-20 as well as Sri S.S.Mishra, learned counsel for the Respondent/Bihar School Examination Board.

Ten petitioners have approached this Court, invoking its writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, with a prayer to direct the Respondents to select/qualify petitioner nos. 1 to 6 and 10 in the Bihar Elementary Teacher Eligibility Test,2011 and petitioner nos.7,8 and 9 in the Bihar Secondary Teacher Eligibility Test,2011 by rectifying the results/re-valuating the OMR sheet of the petitioners.

It was claimed by learned counsel for the petitioners that after publication of the result since error was committed, they had raised objection and finally in the year 2014 representations were filed by the petitioners for making correction.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in identical situation, number of other writ petitions were disposed of by this Court in relation to same dispute. Learned counsel for the petitioners has specifically referred to Annexure-4 series of the writ petition, which are recent orders passed by this Court. It has been claimed that at least writ petition may be disposed of, so that the case of the petitioners may be examined.

Fact remains that the result of the said examination, which was held in the year 2011, was published in the year 2012



and the present writ petition has been filed in the year 2015 with a prayer to correct the result.

It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that many irregularities were committed in publication of the result and, as such, this Court on number of occasions has interfered with the matter.

Besides hearing learned counsel for the parties, I have also perused the materials available on record, particularly Annexure-5 series, which indicate that the petitioners had requested for making correction. On going through the record, particularly some orders, it appears that in some cases, stand has been taken that the entire record, which were huge in numbers, were destroyed .

Keeping in the fact that the result was published in the year 2012 and only objection was raised in the year 2014, which have been brought on record, the Court is of the opinion that at such belated stage , there is no reason to entertain the present writ petition.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--

