

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10335 of 2019

=====

Vivek Kumar Son of Hemant Kumar Yadav Resident of Village and Post-
Rampur, Ward No. 13, P.S. Murliganj, Distt- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection
Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The District Level Selection committee Madhepura through its Chairman.
3. The District Magistrate, Madhepura.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Madhepura.
5. The Block Supply Officer Murliganj, Madhepura.
6. Shobhanand Kumar Son of Bal Krishna Yadav Resident of Village and Post -
Rampur, Ward No. 12, P.S.- Murliganj, Distt- Madhepura

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC 4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 02-01-2023

Heard Mr. Vijay Anand, learned Advocate for the

petitioner and Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh for the State.

The petitioner is aggrieved by grant of license to

respondent no. 6, who was placed below the petitioner in

the provisional merit-list which was prepared after inquiry.

Later, the final list shows that the petitioner was not



considered at all even though he is a Graduate and has computer ability.

It is the contention of the petitioner that in the event of all qualifications of his and the respondent no. 6 being same, a person with higher marks in Graduation was to be selected. If that were also same, then perhaps a person, older in age was to be given preference in accordance with the rules.

There appears to be no consideration over all this as the name of the petitioner does not find mention at all in the final merit list.

In view of the controversy raised on behalf of the petitioner with respect to the candidature of respondent no. 6, we deem it appropriate to direct the petitioner to make a suitable complaint before the Commissioner of the Division within a period of thirty days, who after affording reasonable opportunity to him, shall dispose of such complaint within a period of sixty days thereafter with a



reasoned order. The respondent no. 6 shall also be heard before any decision is taken.

With the afore-noted direction/observation, the petition stands disposed of.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

krishna/kundan

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	05.01.2023
Transmission Date	

