

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.808 of 2015

=====

Rajesh Prasad Yadav son of Laxman Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village- Kabirpur, Post Office - Sidhwalia, Police Station - Mohammadpur, District- Gopalgang.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director, Resarch and Training Centre Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Gopalgang.
3. The District Education Officer, Gopalgang.
4. The Programme Officer, (Establishment) , Gopalgang.
5. The Block Education Officer, Baikunthpur, Gopalgang.
6. The Principle, District Eduction and Training Centre Thawe, Gogalgang.
7. Subash kumar son of Prayag Baitha, Resident of Village- Sonwalia, Block+ Police Station- Baikunthpur, District- Gogalgang. At present working as Block Teacher Government upgraded Middle School Girls (Sonwalia), Block- Baikunthpur, District- Gopalgang.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :
For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN
AMANULLAH

ORAL ORDER

5 05-01-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; State and respondent no. 7.

2. The petitioner had moved the Court for the following relief:-

“That this petition is for quashing the letter No-92 dated 2.09.2014 as well as Letter No-261 dated 08.9.2014 contained in Annexure-3 respectively whereby and where under the private Respondent No-7 namely Subash Kumar has been selected as C.R.C.C for SHANKUL SANSADHAN KENDRA, Rajapatti, Block-Baikunthpur, District-Gopalgang, ignoring the claim of the



petitioner and petitioner has been directed to hand over the charge to the Respondent No. 7.”

3. The grievance relates to the selection of respondent no. 7 as C.R.C.C for Shankul Sansadhan Kendra, Rajapatti, Block-Baikunthpur, District-Gopalganj.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that now the B.Ed. degree obtained by the respondent no. 7, on the basis of which he was eligible for being considered for selection as C.R.C.C. itself has been found to be suspicious, the selection needs to be interfered with.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent no. 7 submitted that the said objection is totally frivolous for the reason that the authorities have not doubted the authenticity of the degree obtained by him but are raising a technical question as to whether the petitioner had pursued the course after taking permission. Even in this regard, learned counsel submitted that with due permission he had obtained the graduation degree as well as B.Ed degree and moreover, as of now, since the post of C.R.C.C. is a tenure post of three years with there being provision that there cannot be a second term, he already having crossed the period, nothing remains in the present writ



application.

6. Learned counsel for the State, on the basis of averments made in the counter affidavit, submitted that at the relevant time when the selection was being made, the respondent no. 7 had better marks percentage both in graduation and B.Ed. as compared to the petitioner and thus, rightly he was selected.

7. Having considered the aforesaid, this Court does not find any reason to interfere in the matter. Accordingly, the writ application stands disposed off.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

Ajay Gupta/-

U			
---	--	--	--

