

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7725 of 2019

-
-
1. Aasu Kumar Singh S/o Sri Sunil Kumar Singh, R/o Vill and P.O. - Dariyapur. P.S. - Mufassil, District - Bhojpur.
 2. Rajesh Kumar Gupta, S/o Sri Shambhu Saw, R/o Vill and P.O. - Andhari, P.S. - Chauri, District - Bhojpur.
 3. Nitish Kumar Gautam S/o Gauri Shankar Gautam R/o Vill - Gyanpur, P.O. - Nathmalpur, District - Bhojpur.
 4. Om Nath Singh S/o Brij Kumar Singh R/o - Vill and P.O. - Mahuar, District - Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Central Selection Board Constable Recruitment, through its Chairman, Sri Sai Tara Complex, IAS Colony, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.
4. The Chairman, Central Selection Board Constable Recruitment, Sri Sai Tara Complex, IAS Colony, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vishal Vikram Rana, Advocate Mr. Indrajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Mrigendra Kumar, AC to GA-4
For the CSBC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh, Advocate Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 09-05-2019



1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioners had applied against the Advertisement No. 1 of 2018 for being selected as a Driver Constable for which examination was conducted by the Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment).

3. The petitioners were unsuccessful.

4. The main grievance of the petitioners is that no cut-off marks for each category was disclosed and the appointment process remained completely opaque, giving an impression that the examination was not conducted in a fair manner. Because of such apprehension in the mind of the petitioners, a further request has been made in the writ petition for a direction to the respondent Board to produce CCTV footage, especially of the driving test, which was held between 05.01.2019 to 12.01.2019.

5. Mr. Sanjay Pandey, learned Advocate for the Central Selection Board submits that petitioner nos. 1, 3 and 4 belong to general category, for which the cut-off marks was 74 and the petitioners had obtained 68, 62 and 65 marks respectively, which was below the cut-off marks. Petitioner no.



2 hails from EBC category, for which the cut-off marks was fixed at 58 and the petitioner no. 2 has obtained 54 marks.

6. It has further been submitted on behalf of the Board that if the petitioners would have applied for the cut-off marks and their individual marks respectively, the same would have been provided to them. It is also submitted that the submission of the petitioners that the cut-off marks is not provided is incorrect. The cut-off marks for each category was actually published by the Board along with the result.

7. With respect to the prayer for production of CCTV footage, Mr. Pandey has submitted that the purpose for installing CCTV camera at the venue of examination was to keep surveillance for preventing any outside interference in the examination process. The camera was not fixed in the field where driving test was conducted.

8. In that view of the matter, even if the prayer of the petitioners is allowed and the CCTV footage is summoned, it will provide no input to this Court or to the petitioners to make any comment with respect to the examination having been conducted fairly.



9. In any view of the matter, since the petitioners had not obtained requisite marks, they were not declared successful.

10. There does not appear to be any merit in the case and thus the writ petition is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

skm/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	11.05.2019
Transmission Date	

