

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.724 of 2020

-
-
1. Jogen Lal Singh @ Jogendra Kumar Das @ Jogen Das Son of Shri Balikant Das, Resident of Village-Mirpokhar, P.O.-Sudhani, P.S.-Barsoi, District-Katihar.
 2. Prabhat Kumar Das, Son of Jogen Lal Singh @ Jogendra Kumar Das, Resident of Village-Mirpokhar, P.O.-Sudhani, P.S.-Barsoi, District-Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through Chairman, Railway Board, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, North Frontier Railway, Maligaon, Assam.
3. The Divisional Railway Manager, N.F. Railway, Katihar.
4. The Divisional Railway Manager (P), N.F. Railway, Katihar.
5. The Sr. Sectional Engineer, Dalkhola, N.F. Railway, Katihar.
6. The APO-III, N.F. Railway, Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Gautam Saha, Adv.
For UOI	:	Mrs. Punam Kumari Singh, Adv. CGC

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

- 3 21-06-2022 In the instant petition, petitioner has assailed the order of the Tribunal dated 04.08.2017 passed on O.A. No.050/00019 of 2014, Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna Bench, Patna vide Annexure-1. The petitioner's claim is that they are entitled to appointment under the LARGESSE Scheme formulated by the Railway Board. Crux of the matter in the present petition is whether petitioners do fulfill the minimum educational qualification as prescribed in the LARGESSE



Scheme or not? The minimum educational qualification is pass in Class 10th . The Tribunal has examined complete records of the petitioners read with the LARGESSE Scheme and found that petitioners have not fulfilled the minimum educational qualification passed in 10th standard. In the light of the findings given by the Tribunal the petitioners have not made out the case so as to interfere with the Tribunal's order. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that in the subsequent scheme the prescription of 10th standard has been removed, therefore, the petitioners are entitled to appointment under the LARGESSE Scheme. Such a contention cannot be appreciated for the simple reason that the criteria is required to be examined with reference to the date of eligibility of the petitioners read with the LARGESSE Scheme. Therefore, the aforesaid contention of the petitioners stands rejected.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Prakash Narayan /-

U			
---	--	--	--

