

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.680 of 2019

=====

Beauty Kumari Daughter of Bhola Singh Resident of Village-Adma, P.S.
Narari Kala Khurd, District-Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna
3. The Chairman, Central Selection Board of Constable, Bihar, Patna, Sri Sai Tara Complex, I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar
For the State	:	Mr.Md. Harun Quareshi, AC to SC 1
For CSBC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 18-07-2019 Heard counsel for the petitioner and counsel for the respondents-State as well counsel for the Board.

Petitioner was an applicant in response to Advertisement no. 01/2017 issued by respondent-Board for selection of constables. Instead of 31.12.1996, petitioner admittedly due to inadvertence, filled up 31.12.1998 as her date of birth. She realized her mistake later and moved the authority seeking opportunity to rectify the mistake. Authority had rejected her candidature as well as request for an opportunity to remove the defect by assigning reason that mismatch has occurred in the entry made in on-line application with the date of birth recorded in the certificate in support of her application.



Counsel for the petitioner submits that mistake was bonafide as the petitioner was not gaining anything by writing 98 instead of 96. Petitioner should be allowed one opportunity to rectify the mistake.

Bonafide of the petitioner having regard to the fact that she could not gain by writing 98 could have been a factor to be considered, but for the fact that the advertisement pursuant to which she had applied clearly stipulates that opportunity to rectify such error was to be availed by the candidate within one day after last date of submission of form i.e. upto 31.08.2017. Petitioner has approached the authority much later. Petitioner has to abide by terms and conditions contained in the advertisement to which she had applied. She cannot be permitted further latitude than what is allowed in terms of the advertisement, as standard has to be uniform for all candidates.

It is also submitted by counsel for the Board that recommendation for process of selection has been forwarded by the respondents as far back as on 13.06.2018.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this court would observe that the petitioner is not entitled to any further opportunity.

Writ petition is devoid of merit and the same is



dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

s.hassan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

