

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7539 of 2023

1. Rajiv Kumar, Son of Gholti Prasad Sharma Resident of Village- Mahdatpur, P.O.- Yamunia, P.S.- Nawgachhiya, District- Bhagalpur.
2. Arbind Kumar, Son of Shri Rajendra Mandal Resident of Jangali Tola Kadwa, P.O.- Khairpur Kadwa, P.S.- Nawagachhiya, District- Bhagalpur.
3. Gajendra Kumar, Son of Bindeshwari Prasad Singh Resident of Village- Paraspur Kadwa, P.O.- Khairpur Kadwa, P.S.- Dholbazza, District- Bhagalpur.

Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Home Guard, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Additional Director General of Police, Home Guard, Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
6. The Superintendent of Police, Bhagalpur.
7. The Commandant, Home Guard, Bhagalpur.
8. The Selection Committee, Home Guard, Naugachhiya, Bhagalpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satyendra Prasad Singh, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar, AC to GP-4

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 18-09-2023 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioners were applicant in the process of selection of Home Guard under advertisement No. 02 of 2011.

3. It is not in dispute that petitioner nos. 1 and 2 were candidates in Extremely Backward Classes (EBC) and petitioner no. 3 was a candidate in the Backward Classes (BC) category.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that due



to large scale corruption in the process, they have not been selected and seek a direction upon the respondents to select the petitioners on the post of Constable.

5. The petitioners were declared successful in the physical test.

6. The respondents have placed on record the fact that the last selected candidate under the petitioner nos' 1 & 2 category, i.e., EBC, had a score of 9, whereas the petitioner nos 1 & 2 scored 7 and 6 respectively, i.e., less than the last selected candidate.

7. The last selected candidate under the petitioner no. 2 category, i.e., BC, had a score of 11. The petitioner no. 3 scored only 9.

8. The petitioners were thus, below the cutoff/last selected candidates in their respective category. These facts are not in dispute.

9. The petitioners therefore have no case on merits, for their appointment.

10. Writ application is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

SUMIT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

