

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16883 of 2018

=====

Sunita Kumari, Daughter of Chandrika Prasad Chaudhary, Resident of Village-Nauka Tola Daunaha, Post Office-Daunaha, Police Station- Dharnha, District-West Champaran at Bettiah.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The A.D.G. Headquarter, Patna.
4. The Secretary, Bihar Police Subordinate Service Commission, Santosh Mension B-Block, Near, R.P.S. Law College, Raghunath Path, Danapur, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Jitendra Kumar Roy, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dharmendra Kumar, AC to GP-5
For BPSSC	:	Mr. Kunal Tiwary, Advocate
		Mr. Aniket Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-07-2019

I.A. No.1 of 2019

In this interlocutory application, a prayer has been made to amend the writ petition and the facts mentioned in this application should be treated to be a part of the main writ application.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is allowed and the averments made in this interlocutory application will be treated to be the part of the main writ petition.

CWJC No.16883 of 2018

Heard the parties.



The basic premise of claim of the petitioner is in two parts. First part is with regard to reservation rule, which has wrongly been applied and by I.A. No. 1 of 2019, a prayer has been made that she has wrongly been disqualified on account of error in the signature. She applied against the post advertised for the post of Sub-Inspector, she was selected in the preliminary test and whereafter she appeared in the main test, her final result has not been published for the reason assigned that there is an error in signature.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no such column and category for rejecting the candidature of a candidate without evaluation of the answer sheets, which she has done in the main examination.

This Court is not in a position to give a finding with regard to the evaluation of the answer sheets of the petitioner, but Annexure-7 makes a very clear that she has been disqualified on account of error in signature, error in signature may be different kinds, one of the kind may be that her signature is not tallying with the original signature for different reasons and during argument, an alternative prayer has been made for reevaluation of answer sheet. This Court has asked the petitioner to show the rules and regulations for reevaluation, but that has not been produced and so



far as disqualification on account of error in signature is concerned, this Court is not sitting in appeal over the finding recorded and give a direction for the relief the petitioner is seeking in the present application.

In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in this writ application and, accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	23.07.2019
Transmission Date	N.A.

