

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3661 of 2018

-
-
1. Md. Ayub and Ors Son of Late Md. Ibrahim resident of Village- Bheriyani, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga.
 2. Shashi Kumar, Son of Late Phulkant Prasad, resident of Village Kasnaraini, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga.
 3. Md. Neyaz Ahamad, Son of Late Md. Shamshul Hoda, resident of Village Gairpur, P.S. Sadar Darbhanga District- Darbhanga.
 4. Md. Nesarul Haque, Son of Late Md. Israrul Haque, resident of Village Gairpur, P.S. Sadar Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.
 5. Md. Kamalluddin, Son of Late Md. Pachkauri, resident of Village Bisfi Hat, P.S. Bisfi, District- Madhubani.
 6. Md. Sagir Ahmad, Son of Late Md. Daud resident of Village Bisfi Hat, P.S.- Bisfi, District- Madhubani.
 7. Mahamaya Prasad Yadav, Son of Late Rajkumar Yadav, Resident of Village- Koyalasthan, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga.
 8. Gurudeo Prasad Sinha, Son of Late Kedar Prasad Sinha, Resident of Village Buchchamon Sundarpur Bira, P.S.- Darbhanga Sadar District- Darbhanga.
 9. Kumari Madhu, wife of Bhola Pd Yadav, Resident of Village Buchchamon Sundarpur Bira, P.S.- Darbhanga Sadar District- Darbhanga.
 10. Md. Razi Alam, Son of Late Md. Aatur Rahman, Resident of Village Loam, P.S.- Sadar Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. Principal Secretary, Human Resources, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Bihar State Staff Selection Commission, Veterinary, College Campus Patna- 80014 through it's Secret
4. Secretary, Bihar State Staff Selection Commission, Veterinary College Campus, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Binodanand Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Smt.Binita Singh -Sc28
For BSSC	:	Mr. Satyabir Bharti, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

3 18-07-2022

1. Heard the parties.

2. Admittedly, the petitioners they were applied for the posts, which were advertised in the year 2010. However, on the basis that their result has been declared in the year 2017 w.e.f. 1998, in pursuance of the directions issued by this Court, the petitioners cannot be given any leverage to treat them as applicants against the post which were advertised in the year 2010.

3. Even, if the posts are like vacant or at falling vacant subsequently, candidates would not have a right to participate in such a selection process, after the selection process is already started.

4. Keeping in view thereto, claim of the petitioners is found to be wholly mis-conceived and is accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Pravinkumar/-

Item No. 8

U			
---	--	--	--