

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.1246 of 2018

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.589 of 2018

Shreenidhi Kumar, Son of Shatrudaman Kumar, Resident of Village +P.O.-
Parsaunikapoor, P.S.-Patahi, District-East Champaran, Presently residing-
Ward No.30 In front of Bachpan Play School, Mohalla- Parsauni Sadan, P.S.-
Motihari, East Champaran, Motihari

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Department of Agriculture, Department Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chairman, Bihar Staff Selection Commission, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar Staff Selection Commission, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Ojha, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ankit Katriar, A.C. to A.A.G.13

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 30-11-2018

Heard Mr. Ajay Kumar Ojha, learned counsel for the
appellant and Mr. Ankit Katriar, learned counsel for the State.

This appeal assails the judgment dated 31st July, 2018
contending that as a matter of fact the appellant did have the
requisite experience even up to the last date that was extended
i.e., up to 14th June, 2015. Consequently, he claimed 30 marks as
against the awarded 20 marks to him on this count.

The matter was examined by the learned single Judge
and it was found that as a matter of fact the work experience



certificate, which the appellant had provided, was dated 7th May, 2015. Not only this, at the time when the appellant approached the authorities for the redressal of his grievances then too also he attached the same working certificate that was up to 7th May, 2015. The appellant could have submitted a certificate for the extended period i.e., up to 14th June, 2015 but in fact while he tendered his objection on 6th June 2017, he had been unable to furnish any such certificate so as to avail of the marks as claimed by him. Consequently, the learned single Judge came to the conclusion that 20 marks had been rightly awarded as against work experience to the appellant.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we find no reason to alter the said conclusion of the learned single Judge, which is a fact that remains undisputed. Consequently, no error can be found in the impugned judgment.

Consigned to records.

(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)

(Anjana Mishra, J)

Saif/Sujit

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

