

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.154 of 2018

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1322 of 2017

=====

Punam Kumari Daughter of Late Anjani Kumar Singh, wife of Binay Kumar Singh, resident of Mohalla- High School Road, Old Ward No. 13, New Ward No. 19, P.S.- Forbesganj, District- Araria (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Chairman, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna-800017
2. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna- 800017.
3. The Assistant Secretary (Purnia), Bihar School Examination Board, Patna-800017.
4. The Principal, Govt. Women Teacher Training College, Forbisganj, Araria.
5. Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anil Kumar Mukund, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Gyan Shankar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

6 19-06-2019 Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

2. From the records, it is evident that there is no dispute that the applicant had only 437 marks. The fact remains that the applicant was admitted on the strength of incorrect depiction of 637 marks.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that this was no mistake on the part of the applicant and if the respondents have indicated any such thing in their documents



nothing can be attributed to the applicant for the purpose of any admission which was granted after the applicant had submitted correct documents which indicated only 437 marks.

4. The aforesaid position even if accepted that the applicant is not responsible for any such incorrect depiction then to even the beneficiary is the applicant of the aforesaid projection of marks which is 200 more in number than the actual marks obtained by the applicant. The matter was taken up in the Supreme Court where the SLP was withdrawn with liberty to approach the High Court on the ground of placing more correct facts and documents on record to substantiate this claim.

5. We have perused the entire material but the fact remains that the applicant was a beneficiary of incorrect depiction of marks which does not entitled him to any relief. The application being misconceived and there is no error apparent on the face of record, no ground is made out. The review is rejected.

(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)

(Nilu Agrawal, J)

rajesh/devendra

U			
---	--	--	--

