

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 8209 OF 2018

Shri Mallikarjunaraji Ellabonia s/o Parvathalu Ellabonia

..vs..

The Reserve Bank of India, thr. it's General Manager and another.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri N.R. Bhishikar, Advocate for petitioner.
Shri R.M. Bhangde, Advocate for respondent no.1.

CORAM : A.S. CHANDURKAR AND VINAY JOSHI, JJ.
DATED : 3rd FEBRUARY, 2020.

The Petitioner has sought appointment on the post of R.B.I. Assistant which examination was conducted by respondent no.1. Since the petitioner's name did not figure in the list of selected candidates, he sought information in that regard. The petitioner was informed that he had failed in the bio-metric verification and hence, he was not selected.

2. It is submitted by the learned Counsel for the petitioner that on 24.01.2017, while entering examination hall the Bio-metric verification was undertaken, but while exiting the examination hall that verification did not match. Since the petitioner's name figured in the list of 20 candidates on the basis of merit, he was liable to be issued an appointment order. Disregarding the fact that the Bio-metric verification was not successful, non-appointment of the petitioner was arbitrary.

Reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent no. 1 in which it has been stated that the petitioner's Bio-metric data was captured while entering examination hall on 24.01.2017. However, that data did not match with the

data which was captured while exiting the examination hall. After his provisional selection, the petitioner was again called upon for the purposes of verification on two occasions, but the data did not match on both occasions. It is therefore, submitted that in terms of the recruitment process, the candidature of the petitioner was not accepted.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, it is found that the petitioner's Bio-metric data was captured on 24.01.2017 when he entered the examination hall. It was necessary for that data to match when the petitioner left the examination hall. The same however did not match. Further, on two other occasions namely on 03.05.2017 and 16.05.2017 said Bio-metric data did not match. Thus, in terms of the recruitment process in view of the fact that the Bio-metric verification was not successful, the petitioner's candidature was cancelled.

4. In the light of the fact that such verification was not successful on three occasions, the decision taken by respondent no. 1 of not selecting the petitioner on that count cannot be said to be arbitrary or irrational. Hence, there is no reason to interfere in writ jurisdiction.

5. Hence, Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

(VINAY JOSHI, J.)

(A.S. CHANDURKAR, J.)