

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18273 of 2014

- =====
1. Samrendra Kumar Sudhansu, son of Sri Mahendra Jha Pankaj, Residing at - Harilochanpur, P.S.- Sarairanjan, District - Samastipur
 2. Santosh Kumar, son of Late Ramudgar Roy, Residing at - Goaeth (Dihuli), P.S. , District - Muzaffarpur
 3. Anjeet Kumar Choudhary, son of Late Amarnath Choudhary, Residing at - Nehra, P.S. Nehra, District - Darbhanga

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Patna
2. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna
3. The Joint Secretary - Cum - Examination Controller, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna
4. The Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi
5. The Principal Secretary, Governor House, Patna, Bihar
6. The Vice - Chancellor, Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University, Darbhanga
7. The Registrar, Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University, Darbhanga
8. The Vice - Chancellor, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara
9. The Registrar, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. A.UJJWAL
For BPSC : Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh, Advocate
For KSDS University : Mr. Gyanand Roy, Advocate
For VKS University : Mr. Rajesh Prasad Choudhary, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 13-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, University
and B.P.S.C.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioners submits that at the relevant time Veer Kunwar Singh
University and Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University
invited applications for appointment, but in the mid way the Bihar



Public Service Commission started selection process and as such the selection process invited by the Veer Kunwar Singh University and Kameshwar Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University came to an end. He submits that till date both the Universities have not communicated the petitioners that the application inviting pursuant to advertisement was closed in view of the subsequent change. Further grievance of the petitioners is that their valuable time is spoiled due to inaction of the University. He further submits that the petitioners have deposited demand draft along with the copy of the application in response to the advertisement and that was not refunded to the petitioners.

3. The issue raised in the present writ application cannot be entertained and adjudicated in the present proceeding. However, liberty shall be available to the petitioners to approach the appropriate court for common law remedy.

4. With the aforesaid remedy, the writ application stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16.07.2018
Transmission Date	

