

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23438 of 2019

=====

Mamta Kumari, Wife of Rajan Ram, Resident of Mohalla-Chabhachcha Chowk, Ward No. 3, Town and P.S. and District-Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Finance, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The General Manager, Circle Office, Punjab National Bank, R. Block, Patna.
3. The Divisional Head, Human Resources Department, Divisional Office, P.N.B., G.M. Road, Darbhanga.
4. The Chief Manager, Divisional Office, P.N.B., G.M. Road, Darbhanga.
5. The Chief Manager, Punjab National Bank, Station Road, Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sarvesh Kumar (GP-24)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 28-11-2019 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner had applied for her appointment as part time sweeper in the Divisional Office, Darbhanga at Punjab National Bank. From Annexure 1, it transpires that she was called for a written test to be held on 12.03.2019. It is the petitioner's case that though she had participated in the test, she has not been subsequently invited for counselling and appointment, though others have been called. There is no averment in the writ application that the petitioner has been declared either successful or unsuccessful in the test held on 12.03.2019. The petitioner is seeking a direction to the



respondents to include her name in the list of persons who have been invited for counselling/appointment as part time sweeper. In the absence of any averment that the petitioner had successfully completed the test held on 12.03.2019, no relief as is being sought in the present application can be granted.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that the respondents have adopted pick and choose method and are going to appoint their favourites. The averment to this effect made in the writ application are completely vague and cannot be the basis for this court to interfere.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bank has, on the other hand, on instructions, has submitted that based on the test in question, a result was published in which the petitioner did not qualify and, therefore, she has not been called for the counselling.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any reason to interfere in the matter.

6. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

arun/-

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

U			
---	--	--	--

