

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15831 of 2011

=====

SUBHASH RANJAN SINGH S/O Sri Sarda Singh R/O Village - Bahuara,
P.O. Mathra, P.S. Surajpura, District - Rohtas

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The Inspector General of Police Administration , Govt. of Bihar, Patna
5. The Central Selection Board, Police Recruitment, Through Its Secretary, Bihar, Back Harding Road, Patna.
6. The Chairman, Central Selection Board, Police Recruitment, Bihar, Back Harding Road, Patna
7. The Secretary, Central Selection Board, Police Recruitment, Bihar, Back Harding Road, Patna

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rajeev Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Prabhajot Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Nishant Kumar Jha, AC to SC-28
For the CSBC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 14-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

counsel for the Central Selection Board, Police Recruitment,

respondent no. 5.

This application has been filed seeking a direction to

the respondents to appoint him on the post of Constable in view

of his having been declared successful in the first phase of the

result published in pursuance of the advertisement No. -1/2009.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the

petitioner had been declared successful in the written test and



was directed to appear in physical test on 03.07.2010. The grievance of the petitioner is that after the physical and written test when the respondents published the final result on 17.08.2010, the name of the petitioner was missing there in the final result.

In response, the respondent no. 5 has filed a counter affidavit wherein, in paragraph '11' a specific statement has been made that the petitioner being a Backward Class Category candidate has secured lesser marks than the last recommended candidate in his category in the written test. It has been pointed out that the petitioner had secured 155 marks but the last recommended candidate in BC-M-NHG category has secured 157 marks in the written test.

Although, the petitioner has filed a rejoinder to the counter affidavit but has failed to point out any case of appointment of a candidate who had secured 155 marks or less than that. This being the position, in the opinion of this Court, this Writ Application cannot succeed. It is dismissed, accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

