

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12630 of 2011

=====

Ashutosh Aman Adhikari, son of Sri Jai Prakash Yadav, resident at Gandhipur,
P.S. Bariarpur, Distt. Munger.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India through its Cabinet Secretary, New Delhi.
2. The Finance Secretary, Union of India, New Delhi.
3. The Chairman, Bank of India, Star House, C-5 "G" Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.
4. The General Manager, Central Recruitment, Bank of India, Star House C-5 "G" Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.
5. The Zonal Manager, Bank of India, Chankya Towers, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna-800001.
6. The Zonal Manager, Bank of India, Adampur Chowk Bhagalpur, Bihar, Pin-812001.
7. The Central Public Information Officer, Bank of India, Star House C-5- 'G' Block, Bandra Kurla Complex Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate Mr. Rana Ishwar Chandra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rupak Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 23-01-2019

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned counsel for the State.

2. In this case, the petitioner is raising a grievance that he has wrongly been refused to be appointed as Clerk, inasmuch as, the Bank has not provided the information, which



he has demanded by filing an application under the Right to Information Act.

3. An advertisement was issued by the Bank for selection/recruitment to the clerical posts, calling upon the interested persons to participate in the selection process. Accordingly, the petitioner has also applied for the said post and appeared in the examination, but he failed to secure a berth in the list of selected candidates and raising grievance that certain selected persons having been not joined and in this connection he has filed an application before the competent authority to provide the names of the persons, who did not join after selection, but the Bank has not provided the same. Further submitted that he has also filed an appeal before the appellate authority, which is still pending.

4. Learned counsel for the Bank submits that the last person, who has been selected under O.B.C. category, has secured 315 marks whereas the present petitioner has only secured 304 marks. There is a big gap in between 304 marks and 315 marks, there would be large number of persons in between the aforesaid marks and nowhere the petitioner has specifically stated about the number of persons, who have not joined the post after recruitment.



5. This Court is not required to deal with that aspect of the matter, but the present case is only confined to his selection to the post of clerk under the O.B.C. category. Admittedly, the petitioner has secured 304 marks and the last person, who has been selected under the O.B.C. category has secured 315 marks.

6. In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in the claim of the petitioner. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N/A.
Uploading Date	24.01.2019
Transmission Date	

