

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.213 of 2018

=====

Rahul Kumar, Son of Kishori Prasad, Resident of New Yarpur, Janta Road,
P.O.-G.P.O. Patna, P.S. - Gardanibagh, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment) through Secretary, Central Selection Board, Sri Sai Tara Complex, I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna.
3. The Chairman, Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment), Sri Sai Tara Complex, I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna.
4. The Secretary, Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment), Sri Sai Tara Complex, I.A.S. Colony, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna
5. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
6. The District Transport Officer, Patna, District - Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramchandra Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ruchikar Jha, AC to SC-8
For C.S.B.C.	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesth, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 10-08-2022

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

2. The petitioner has assailed the select list dated
22.08.2017 issued by the Central Selection Board (Constable
Recruitment) by alleging that the result is arbitrary and illegal.



3. The petitioner has made statement in the writ petition that he has qualified in all the steps during the selection process, including physical eligibility test, driving test as well as the oral test.

4. The Respondent-Board has filed a counter affidavit stating that the petitioner being an applicant under the category of extremely backward caste was awarded 17 marks, as against the cut-off marks 27.

5. Petitioner's counsel has not filed any rejoinder. However, it is submitted that the petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that the authorities have not disclosed the marks awarded to the petitioner with breakup for the various processes undertaken in the selection process and therefore the marks which have been supplied in the counter affidavit are not sustainable.

6. Having considered the rival submissions, this Court would consider the stand of the respondents in their counter affidavit paragraph 8 wherein they have specified the entire selection process in detail. The relevant extract at page 6 of the counter affidavit is being quoted herein:

“Only those candidates will be called for Vehicle Driving Efficiency Test who have passed the Physical Evaluation Test. Driving Vehicle Driving Efficiency



Test consisted of five tests, i.e., (i) Jeep Driving Test, (ii) Car Driving Test, (iii) Bus/Truck Driving Test, (iv) Oral Test with regard to Motor Vehicle Rules and other regulations in which vehicle driving, traffic signs and signals and (v) Oral Test with regard to spare parts of the different vehicles, their maintenance and lubricants, etc. and mechanical difficulties and technical defects in vehicles. Candidates will be given consolidated maximum 50 marks for the aforesaid tests. This mark would be given to the candidate on the basis of their performance in the said tests.”

7. From perusal of the same, it is obvious that consolidated marks were to be awarded and there were no separate marks awarded for the separate steps in the selection process. The oral test as well as driving test were subjected to consolidated 50 marks. That being so, the grievance of the petitioner regarding not being furnished the break-up of marks clearly is unsustainable.

8. This Court would also consider it appropriate to notice that the select list of August, 2017 has been assailed by the petitioner by filing the writ petition in January, 2018.



9. The writ application is without any merits and is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

PNM/Shashank-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	27.08.2022
Transmission Date	N.A.

