

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17328 of 2015

Samresh Kumar Son of Narayan Singh, Resident of Village- Rupdih, P.O.-
Rupdih, P.S.- Mufassil Motihari, District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director General of Police, State of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Central Selection Board Constable Recruitment through its Chairman, Sri Sai Tara Complex, IAS Colony Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.
4. The Chairman, Central Selection Board Constable Recruitment, Sri Sai Tara Complex, IAS. Colony, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sunil Kumar No.III, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Ajay Kumar, AC to GP-4
For CSBC	:	Mr.Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr.Binod Kr. Mishra, Advocate
		Mr.Vivek Anand Amritesh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 22-09-2023 1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief(s):-

“1(a) To quash the final result of Central Selection Board Constable Recruitment (hereinafter referred as the Selection board) published in the daily newspaper on 23.06.2015, for which vacancies had been issued vide Advertisement No.01/2014, as the same is result of mass bungling and malpractice by the successful candidates and Member/Chairman of the Selection board.

(b) To hold proper enquiry/investigation from any independent agency so that the mass bungling committed during the entire process of



selection may be unfolded, and

(c) Further, pending disposal of this application, stay the joining of successful candidates, whose roll numbers have been published in the impugned result.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the respondent-Central Selection Board of Constable, Bihar, Patna, has referred to paragraph no.14 of the counter affidavit, filed in the present case, to submit that in the category of the petitioner i.e. general male non-home guard category, the last selected candidate was possessing 186 marks, which is the cut-off marks, however, since the petitioner had obtained only 99 marks, he could not be selected.

3. The aforesaid factual aspect of the matter is not disputed by the petitioner inasmuch as no rejoinder affidavit has been filed.

4. Having regard to the aforesaid submissions, made by the learned counsel for the respondent-State, I do not find any merit in the present case, hence the same stands dismissed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Saurav/-

U			
---	--	--	--

