

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15418 of 2017

=====

Rajeev Kumar Son of Sahdeo Prasad Resident of Village - Saidpura, P.S. Nagarnausa, District - Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Govt. of Administrative Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of H.R.D. Patna.
3. Bihar Public Service Commission through its Chariman, 15 Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Secretary B.P.S.C. 15 Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Additional Secretary cum Examination Controller, B.P.S.C. 15 Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Bailey Road, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sudish Kumar
For the State	:	Mr. Suman Kumar Jha, AC to AAG-3
For the B.P.S.C.	:	Mr. Satyabir Bharti

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 13-12-2017 Heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned.

The petitioner seeks quashing of the entire result of the 60th to 62nd Common Combined (Preliminary) Competitive Examination, held on 12.02.2017.

The petitioner is said to have secured 92 marks in the said preliminary test; whereas, 93 is the cut off marks.

It is the case of the petitioner that question nos. 46 and 70 of B-series of the test have been wrongly evaluated on the basis of incorrect key answers. According to him, for question no. 46, option C would have been the correct answer; whereas, the said question has been evaluated with option B as the correct answer.



Similar is the case with question no. 70 of the said series, according to the petitioner.

There are two reasons why the petitioner's claim cannot be accepted. Firstly, it is not stated in the writ application that petitioner had given the correct answers at the test, which, according to him, were the correct answers. Secondly, this is an admitted fact that the key answers were put on the website of the Bihar Public Service Commission and objections were invited from the candidates against the said suggested key answers. The petitioner, admittedly, did not raise objection to the said key answers in respect of question nos. 46 and 70.

The petitioner's claim of incorrectness of key-answers, in such circumstance, cannot be gone into.

Reference, in this regard, may also be made to a Division Bench decision of this Court, in the case of **Ravindra Kumar Singh and others v. The High Court of Judicature at Patna and others**, reported in **2016 (1) PLJR 865**.

This application has no merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓		
---	---	--	--

