

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4722 of 2023**

=====

Bechan Paswan, Son of Late Tarani Paswan, resident of Village Khojuchak  
P.O. Sonapur P.S. Bakhtiyarpur, Saharsa, District - Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
3. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
4. The Chairman cum District Magistrate, District Selection Committee (Group- D), Saharsa.
5. The Deputy Collector (Estab) Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Harsh Anuj, Advocate  
For the State : Md. Irshad, AC to SC-1

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      26-09-2023                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner claims that he was empanelled for selection in the year 2006 in a panel prepared by the then District Magistrate. It is further submitted that being a member of the Scheduled Class Category, in view of the cancellation of candidature of three other candidates namely *Bhuvneswari Choudhary*, *Ashok Rajak* and *Satynarayan Ram*, the petitioner should have been offered appointment on a Group-IV post.

3. The court finds that after participating in the 2006 selection process, the petitioner had come to this court in *CWJC*



No. 17233 of 2014 wherein the court passed the following order:-

*“Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.*

*In the present case, the petitioners are submitting that if the panel is prepared, they hope that they will be also there.*

*Let a final decision with regard to such appointment from the panel be completed within six weeks.*

*Accordingly, this writ application stands disposed of.*

*The outcome of the decision will govern the claim of the petitioners.”*

4. The order dated 06.12.2018 passed in *CWJC No. 17233 of 2014* closed the petitioner’s claim, which is clear from the last paragraph of the order that the outcome will govern the petitioner’s claim.

5. Again the same claim is sought to be re-egitated by way of a fresh writ proceedings in the instant writ application. The petitioner cannot claim any right to issue a direction for appointment or consideration of his claim in terms of the representation submitted as it is not a fact that there is any process of recruitment undergoing in which he is an applicant.

6. No directions can be issued by the court in this regard.



7. Writ application is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shashank/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

