

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3873 of 2019

=====

Anshu Ranjan, aged about 31 years, Male, Son of Manoranjan Prasad
Resident of Pancham Bye Lane, Bhurhanath Road, Jagdishpur, P.S- Kotwali,
District- Bhagalpur
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through, the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna
4. The Joint Secretary-Cum-Examination Controller, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate Mr. Rajnish Kumar, Advocate
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Mrigendra Kumar, A.C. to G.A. 4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 27-02-2019

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, it appears that the grievance is that by deleting Question No. 25, the respondents have caused prejudice to the petitioner as his marks stand lowered so as to attain the minimum bench mark fixed. Question No. 25 is as follows:-

“25. Rajjnama is the Persian translation of which Hindi book?

- (A) Ramayana
- (B) Mahabharata
- (C) Ramcharitmanas
- (D) Kavitaavali”



Shri Pandey, learned counsel for the Commission contends that the description of the Persian translation has been incorrectly spelt as 'Rajjnama', whereas the correct spelling is “Rezanama”. Secondly, the question also incorrectly describes the said translation to be of a Hindi book, whereas the same is a translation of Mahabharata, which is in Sanskrit. On account of this ambiguity in the question posed in the question paper, it was resolved to delete the said question from evaluation in all answer sheets.

We do not find any error in the said decision taken by the respondents nor will it cause any prejudice to anyone as the deletion will result in an identical impact on all candidates. Consequently, this is not a case for interference on the ground of violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

The writ petition accordingly stands rejected.

(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)

(Anjana Mishra, J)

P.K.P./-Jagdish

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	28.02.2019
Transmission Date	

