

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2696 of 2023

Narayan Ranjan Ghosh, Son of Gyanendra Nath Ghosh, Resident of Ward No.24, Mohalla-Ruidhasa South near Church, Kishanganj, P.s.-Kishanganj, District-Kishanganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Life Insurance Corporation of India through its Chairman 1st Floor, J.B. Nagar Shopping Centre above Karnataka bank, Borivali, Mumbai, India.
2. The Zonal Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, East Central Zonal Office, Patna.
3. The Divisional Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India. Divisional Officer, Bhagalpur-813210

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Amal Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Rajnikant Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Abhimanyu Vatsa, Advocate
		Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

- 2 19-07-2023 1. The petitioner is an agent of the respondent-Corporation, and has participated in a process for becoming an Apprentice Development Officer (ADO). He has appeared in the written examination and was called for interview under communication dated 21-10-2019. Thereafter, he has not been selected as an ADO.
2. The petitioner has approached the authority and his grievance was considered and under intimation dated 07-09-2020 addressed to the petitioner, he has been informed that he did not complete 50 lives in any of the preceding 3 years prior



to the selection process, that is, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19. He has also not mentioned his business performance details for the years 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2011.

3. For not fulfilling the requisite criteria, his claim for becoming an ADO has been rejected.

4. The prerequisites for becoming an ADO, as per the reasons assigned in the communication dated 07-09-2020 are not in dispute.

5. The petitioner's counsel however submits that he was qualified in the written and was interviewed also and therefore he should have been made an ADO.

6. Merely because he has been called for interview, this Court finds that the petitioner would have no right to be enforced by the issuance of a writ for making him an ADO, since the interview letter itself contains a clause which reads as follows:

"16. Before coming for the interview please ensure that you are eligible according to the eligibility criteria stipulated in the advertisement notification. If you are not eligible, your candidature will be cancelled at any stage of recruitment."

7. The other aspect is that the petitioner has a forum



of appeal, which he has not availed before the authorities. Though his claim has been rejected as far back as in September, 2020, the application has been filed in the year February, 2023.

8. For the above noted reasons, this Court finds that no enforceable claim is made out in the writ petition, and the same is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

SUMIT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

