

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2724 of 2023

=====

Ranjan Kumar Son of Late Nagina Ram Resident of Village- Garikhana, P.S.-
Khagaul, District- Patna, 801105. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, Central Bank of India Chandra Mukhi,
Nariman Point, Bombay, 400021.
2. The Zonal Manager (HRD), Central Bank of India, Block B, 2nd Floor
Mouryalok Complex, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna.
3. The Regional Manager (HRD) Central Bank of India, Block B, 2nd Floor
Mouryalok Complex, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna.
4. Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Phulwarisharif, Branch, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rajib Ranjan Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Anup Kumar Sinha, Advocate
		Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 19-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the Bank.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking the following
reliefs:-

“1. That the present writ application is being filed
for issuance of appropriate writ or writs, direction
or directions for setting aside the letter dated
12.01.2023 vide no.ZO/Pat/HRD/2022-23/1679
issued by the Chief Manager HRD from the office
of respondent no.2 whereby and whereunder, the
Central office has returned the application for
compassionate appointment of the petitioner since
he is not fulfilling the education qualification and
age criteria as per recruitment policy and advised
the Respondent no.3 to return the application to
the petitioner and or issuance of appropriate writ



or writs directions to the respondents to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground after death of her mother who died in harness on 09.06.2015 and or issuance of any other writ or writs under the facts and circumstances of the case.”

In view of the statements made in paragraph ‘13’ of the counter affidavit specifically stating that the minimum 10th standard passed is the eligibility qualification and that the petitioner was more than 32 years old on the date of his application for compassionate appointment which is more than the maximum age limit of 31 years even after including relaxation of five years for the post of Safai Karamchari, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order as contained in Annexure- ‘5’ to the writ application.

This application is, thus, dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

