

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8993 of 2023

=====

Kumar Mukesh, son of Prem Prakash Singh, Resident of Village and P.O.-
Amoura, P.S.-Karakat, District-Rohtas, Bihar-802214.

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Department of Science and Technology and Technical Education, Government of Bihar, Vishveshwarya Bhawan, Patna.
4. The Director, Department of Science and Technology and Technical Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Rohtas.
6. The Bihar Public Service Commission through the Secretary, 15, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.
7. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, 15, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.
8. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, 15, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.
9. The Controller of Examination, Bihar Public Service Commission, 15, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Patna.
10. Atul Srivastava son of not known to the petitioner, resident of not known to the petitioner, Roll No. 660028, at serial no. 33 in the final result dated 01.06.2023 published against advertisement no. 66/2020 through the Bihar Public Service Commission.

... .. **Respondents**

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Kumar Kaushik, Advocate
For the BPSC	:	Ms. Parul Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sheo Shankar Prasad, SC-8
		Mr. Ruchikar Jha, AC to SC-8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-09-2023

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the Bihar Public Service Commission as also
learned counsel for the State.

2. Petitioner, in the present case, is seeking the



following reliefs:

“i. For issuance of an order, direction or a writ of certiorari for quashing and setting aside the result dated 01.06.2023 published by the respondent Bihar Public Service Commission against the advertisement number 66/2020 published for recruitment to the post of Assistant Professor in the subject of Mathematics in various Government Engineering Colleges, to the extent to which the petitioner has been excluded and has been denied the benefit of horizontal reservation under the category of Grand Child of Ex-Freedom Fighter whereas respondent no. 10 has been illegally selected in place of the petitioner.

ii. For issuance of an order, direction or a writ of mandamus for directing the respondent authorities to consider the petitioner for appointment under the category of grand Child of Ex-Freedom Fighter against advertisement number 66/2020 published for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor in the subject of Mathematics in different Engineering Colleges in the State of Bihar.

iii. For issuance of an order, direction or an appropriate writ for keeping one post under the general category to be vacant during the pendency of this writ application inasmuch as the last selected male candidate under the general category ought not have been selected if the petitioner was considered for appointment under the category of Grand Child of Ex-Freedom Fighter.”

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he applied for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor in the subject of Mathematics in Government Engineering College for which an advertisement bearing no. 66/2020 was issued by the Bihar Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the “Commission”). A copy of the advertisement has been placed on the record as Annexure ‘P1’ to the writ application.



4. The petitioner filed his application and claimed that he is the grand-son of Freedom Fighter. As per the terms for advertisement, he would have been entitled to be considered against the horizontal reservation to the extent of 2% provided for the family members of the Freedom Fighter. The petitioner enclosed an identity card which was issued on 11.03.2008 by the District Magistrate, Patna.

5. It is stated that the Commission issued an admit card in favour of the petitioner, he appeared in the examination, passed the written examination and was called for interview. It is stated that the petitioner informed the Commission at the time of his interview that he had applied for obtaining a certificate as envisaged in the advertisement (Annexure 'P1'), however, such certificate was yet to be issued. He, however produced a copy of the identity card which was in his possession. The petitioner received the certificate on 07.03.2023 whereafter he forwarded the same to the Commission on 10.03.2023, at this stage, the petitioner visited the office of the Commission on 11.03.2023 and also submitted a copy of the certificate.

6. The grievance of the petitioner is that when final result was published by the Commission on 01.06.2023 in which total 108 candidates were selected and out of that, 45



candidates were under the general/unreserved category, the name of petitioner did not appear in the select list. It is stated that the candidate at serial no. 33 namely, Atul Srivastava had been selected, since the petitioner had been denied the benefit of reservation under the category of the grand child of Ex-Freedom Fighter.

7. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the Commission has provided opportunities to those candidates who had not submitted the exemption certificate showing that they had obtained their Ph.D. degree prior to July 11, 2009 by fulfilling the required conditions.

8. Learned counsel has taken this Court through Annexures 'P10' and 'P11' to the writ application to submit that such candidates who did not produce the exemption certificate were given two opportunities to produce the certificates even after the interview was over.

9. Learned counsel has further relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Dolly Chhanda Vs. Chairman, Jee and Others** reported in (2005) 9 SCC 779; **Union Public Service Commission Vs. Gyan Prakash Srivastava** reported in (2012) 1 SCC 537; **Dheerender Singh Paliwal Vs. Union Public Service**



Commission reported in **(2017) 11 SCC 276**; and **Food Corporation of India Vs. Rimjhim** reported in **(2019) 5 SCC 793** to submit that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has in similar circumstances considered those cases applying the ratio of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Charles K. Skaria and Others Vs. Dr. C. Mathew and Others** reported in **(1980) 2 SCC 752** and held in favour of the petitioners of those cases and issued directions to the concerned respondents to consider the case of the petitioners for appointment on merit, if all other conditions stands satisfied. It is, thus, submitted that the result published by the Commission be quashed and a direction be issued to the Commission to consider the case of the present petitioner by accepting the certificate produced by the petitioner on 10.03.2023/11.03.2023.

Stand of the Commission

10. Contesting the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the Commission has taken a stand that under the Advertisement No. 66/2020, it is clearly provided in paragraph 6(vii) that the grand children of such Ex-freedom fighters who get pension from the central government are eligible to get the benefit of 2% of horizontal reservation, however Note 2(16) to paragraph '6' makes it very clear that the



candidates claiming to be the grand-children of Ex-freedom fighters are required to submit a certificate duly issued under the signature of the District Magistrate or any officer so authorized by the District Magistrate at the time of interview. Learned counsel submits that para 'XIV' are relevant for reservation for the grand children of the freedom fighters.

11. It is the specific stand of the Commission that the interview programme dated 03.02.2023 at paragraph 3(xix) made it clear that certificates of proof issued in the prescribed format has to be necessarily verified from the original and also states that ID proof will not be valid/accepted. Similarly the interview letter in clause '4(xix)' reiterates the stipulation as made in para '3(xix)' of the interview programme.

12. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner had submitted his online application and had mentioned an ID Card dated 11.03.2008 regarding his claim of reservation under the FFD category. Since the ID Card is not a valid certificate in terms of advertisement, hence it was not accepted.

13. Learned counsel has drawn a distinction between the case of the petitioner and that of those candidates who could not submit their exemption certificate with regard to their having completed Ph.D. degree prior to 11th July, 2009. It is



submitted that those who had obtained their Ph.D. degree prior to 11th July, 2009 were duly qualified to make application for appointment, however, in order to satisfy with regard to such candidates who had obtained their Ph.D. degree prior to 11th July, 2009, the Commission had called upon them to produce the exemption certificate which was to be issued by the Registrar or Dean (Academic affairs of the University concerned) in terms of the University Grants Commission Notification dated 18th July, 2018.

14. Learned counsel submits that the judgments which have been placed before this Court on behalf of the petitioner would not come to the rescue of the petitioner for the reason that in none of those cases the candidates were seeking reservation of any nature and had failed to produce the required certificate in support of his/their claim. Learned counsel submits that in fact the ratio of the judgment in **Food Corporation of India** (supra) would show that those judgments were rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a different facts situation. Referring to paragraphs '11' and '13' of the judgment in the case of **Food Corporation of India** (supra), learned counsel points out that in the said case, the writ petitioner had failed to produce the certificate of one year's experience even at the time of



verification of documents. When it was contended on behalf of the FCI that the writ petitioner did not produce the certificate, the Hon'ble Supreme Court took note of the fact that at the time of verification of the documents, the writ petitioner was not informed/told that the letter dated 27.08.2014 which was produced by the petitioner was not sufficient to establish the essential requirement of one year's experience. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further noted that the writ petitioner was also not told/informed at the time of verification of documents on 18.01.2016 that certificate of one year's experience is lacking.

15. It is submitted that in the present case, the advertisement itself had provided that the candidate is required to submit a certificate and that certificate should have been issued in a prescribed format and the petitioner should be in possession on the date of making his application.

16. Learned counsel submits that at this stage when the result has already been published if this Court interferes, the whole result would be disturbed. It is also submitted that on the face of the specific stipulation in the advertisement if the petitioner has not abided by the same, any interference by this Court in its extraordinary writ jurisdiction would amount to imposing a condition over and above the stipulation present in



the advertisement which is likely to be cited as a precedent and in such circumstance, there would always be a possibility of interference with the results already published by the Commission. Submission is that such situations be avoided.

Consideration

17. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the Commission and the State as also on perusal of the records, this Court finds that the facts are not much in dispute. The advertisement (Annexure 'P1' to the writ application) in paragraph '6(vii)' reads as under:

“6. (vii) सामान्य प्रशासन विभाग, बिहार के पत्रांक— 2526, दिनांक— 18.02.2016 के आलोक में राज्य के वैसे स्वतंत्रता सेनानियों जिन्हें केन्द्र द्वारा पेंशन स्वीकृत है, के पोता/पोती/नाती/नतीनी को इस विज्ञापन की कंडिका 1(ख) में वर्णित में रिक्ति के अनुसार 02 प्रतिशत क्षैतिज आरक्षण देय होगा। ऐसे आरक्षण का दावा करने वाले अभ्यर्थियों के पास आवेदन करते समय अपने गृह जिला के जिला पदाधिकारी या उनके द्वारा प्राधिकृत पदाधिकारी के हस्ताक्षर से निर्गत (भूतपूर्व स्वतंत्रता सेनानी के पोता/पोती/नाती/नतीनी होने का) प्रमाण-पत्र निश्चित रूप से उपलब्ध होना चाहिए।”

18. Admittedly, the petitioner did not possess a certificate as required under the aforementioned paragraph. He produced an Identity Card which was issued sometime in the year 2008. The petitioner applied for a certificate only after filling up the application form but that was not even available with him at the time of interview. When the interview was over and the Commission was preparing the result, the petitioner



claims to have submitted the certificate by post on 10.03.2023 and physically on 11.03.2023. Apparently, the compliance with paragraph '6(vii)' of the advertisement was lacking and to that extent there is no quarrel.

19. Learned counsel for the petitioner has attempted to make out a case for the petitioner by referring to the UGC Notification dated 18th July, 2018, wherein under the second proviso, it is stated that the award of degree to candidates registered for the M.Phil / Ph.D. programme prior to July 11, 2009 shall be governed by the provisions of the then existing ordinance/bye-laws of regulations of the institutions awarding the degree. All such Ph.D. candidates shall be exempted from the requirement of NET/SLET/SET for recruitment and appointment of Assistant Professor and equivalent positions in Universities/Colleges/Institutions subject to the fulfillment of the following conditions:-

- “a) The Ph.D. degree of the candidate has been awarded in regular mode only;
- b) The Ph.D. thesis has been awarded by at least two external examiners;
- c) An open Ph.D. viva voce of the candidate has been conducted;
- d) The candidate has published two research papers from his/her Ph.D. work out of which at least one is in a referred journal;
- e) The candidate has presented at least two papers, based on his/her Ph.D. work in conferences/seminars sponsored/funded/supported by the



UGC/ICSSR/CSIR or any similar agency.”

The fulfillment of these conditions is to be certified by the Registrar or the Deen (Academic affairs) of the University concerned.

20. The emphasis is on the last line saying that the fulfillment of these conditions is to be certified by the Registrar or the Dean (Academic Affairs) of the University concerned. It is with reference to the last line present in the UGC notification that learned counsel submits that those candidates who had applied by virtue of their Ph.D. under the second proviso but did not submit their exemption certificate when called for at the time of interview, they were given an opportunity to produce and such opportunity was granted to four candidates twice.

21. So far as the similarity which learned counsel for the petitioner has attempted to draw between the case of those Ph.D. candidates who were asked to submit their exemption certificate at the time of interview or later and the case of the present petitioner is concerned, this Court is of the considered opinion that both are standing on two different footings. The case of the petitioner is covered under the terms of the advertisement itself whereunder he was required to possess a certificate as required on the date of making the application which he had not, whereas in case of those Ph.D. candidates who were called for interview with a certificate of exemption,



there was no stipulation in the advertisement that they were required to upload any exemption certificate with their application. It was only with a purpose to satisfy itself the Commission thought at the stage of interview to call upon those Ph.D. degree holders who were covered under the second proviso to come with the exemption certificate.

22. Learned counsel for the Commission has also made it clear that even the date of issuance of exemption certificate was not relevant in those cases. Thus, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner cannot make out a case on the ground of discrimination.

23. So far as the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court placed before this Court are concerned, in the case of **Dolly Chhanda** (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held in paragraphs '7' and '8' as under :

“7. The general rule is that while applying for any course of study or a post, a person must possess the eligibility qualification on the last date fixed for such purpose either in the admission brochure or in application form, as the case may be, unless there is an express provision to the contrary. There can be no relaxation in this regard i.e. in the matter of holding the requisite eligibility qualification by the date fixed. This has to be established by producing the necessary certificates, degrees or marksheets. Similarly, in order to avail of the benefit of reservation or weightage, etc. necessary certificates have to be produced. These are documents in the nature of proof of holding of particular qualification or



percentage of marks secured or entitlement to benefit of reservation. Depending upon the facts of a case, there can be some relaxation in the matter of submission of proof and it will not be proper to apply any rigid principle as it pertains in the domain of procedure. Every infraction of the rule relating to submission of proof need not necessarily result in rejection of candidature.

8. This principle was explained and applied in *Charles K. Skaria v. Dr. C. Mathew*¹. The controversy here related to admission to a postgraduate course in medicine. The relevant rule provided for addition of 10% marks if a candidate possessed a diploma in the relevant subject or subspecialty and this benefit could be given only if the candidate's success in the diploma course was brought to the knowledge of the Selection Committee before completion of selection in an authentic or acceptable manner. The prospectus provided that the attested copies of statement of marks and other documents should be attached with every application. Three such candidates were given admission who had not attached the certificate of having passed the diploma along with their applications. Their admission to postgraduate course was set aside by the High Court on the ground that their applications, wherein they claimed the benefit of diploma, were liable to be rejected as the requisite certificates had not been attached. This Court speaking through Krishna Iyer, J. reversed the judgment of the High Court and held that the admission to the candidates had rightly been given as they had in fact passed the diploma before the date fixed. The relevant parts of paras 20 and 24 of the judgment, where this principle was highlighted are being reproduced below: (SCC pp. 762 & 763)

“20. There is nothing unreasonable or arbitrary in adding 10 marks for holders of a diploma. But to earn these extra 10 marks, the diploma must be obtained at least on or

1 [(1980) 2 SCC 752 : 1980 SCC (L&S) 305]



before the last date for application, not later. Proof of having obtained a diploma is different from the factum of having got it. Has the candidate, in fact, secured a diploma before the final date of application for admission to the degree course? That is the primary question. It is prudent to produce evidence of the diploma along with the application, but that is secondary. Relaxation of the date on the first is illegal, not so on the second. Academic excellence, through a diploma for which extra mark is granted, cannot be denuded because proof is produced only later, *yet before the date of actual selection*. The emphasis is on the diploma; the proof thereof subserves the factum of possession of the diploma and is not an independent factor. ... Mode of proof is geared to the goal of the qualification in question. It is subversive of sound interpretation and realistic decoding of the prescription to telescope the two and make both mandatory in point of time. What is essential is the possession of a diploma before the given date; what is ancillary is the safe mode of proof of the qualification. To confuse between a fact and its proof is blurred perspicacity. To make mandatory the date of acquiring the additional qualification before the last date for application makes sense. But if it is unshakeably shown that the qualification has been acquired before the relevant date, as is the case here, to invalidate this merit factor because proof, though indubitable, was adduced a few days later but before the selection or in a manner not mentioned in the prospectus, but still above board, is to make procedure not the handmaid but the mistress and form not as subservient to substance but as superior to the essence.

24. It is notorious that this formalistic, ritualistic approach is unrealistic and is unwittingly traumatic, unjust and



subversive of the purpose of the exercise. This way of viewing problems dehumanises the administrative, judicial and even legislative processes in the wider perspective of law for man and not man for law. Much of hardship and harassment in administration flows from overemphasis on the external rather than the essential. We think the Government and the Selection Committee rightly treated as directory (not mandatory) the mode of proving the holding of diplomas and as mandatory the actual possession of the diploma. In actual life, we know how exasperatingly dilatory it is to get copies of degrees, decrees and deeds, not to speak of other authenticated documents like marklists from universities, why, even bail orders from courts and government orders from public offices.”
(emphasis in original)

24. In view of the aforesaid observations, ultimately the Hon’ble Supreme Court held that the appellant undoubtedly belonged to a reserved MI category and he may not have noticed mistake which had been committed by the Zila Sainik Board while issuing the first certificate dated 29.06.2003, but it does not mean that the appellant be denied her due when she produced her correct certificate at the stage of second counselling. To this Court, apparently, the facts of the present case are different as in this case, it is not the case of the petitioner that he had produced the certificate but there was a mistake in the said certificate for the reasons beyond the control of the petitioner.

25. This Court has noticed the distinction drawn by learned counsel for the Commission in the case of **Food**



Corporation of India (supra). In the said case, the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in paragraph '10' and '13' have been relied by learned counsel for the petitioner which are as under:-

“**10.** So far as the case on behalf of the FCI that as the original writ petitioner did not produce the certificate of one year's experience along with the application is concerned, it is required to be noted that in the advertisement there was no such requirement. What is provided in the advertisement is that a candidate must have one year's experience of translation from English to Hindi and vice versa along with the other qualifications. The advertisement does not provide specifically and/or provide that a candidate shall produce the certificate of experience along with the application. Therefore, the Division Bench of the High Court has rightly observed that non-production of one year's experience certificate along with the application cannot be said to be fatal to the case of the original writ petitioner and on that ground the original writ petitioner could not have been denied the appointment, if otherwise she is found to be meritorious. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the Division Bench of the High Court.

11. Now so far as the submission on behalf of the FCI that the original writ petitioner did not produce the certificate of one year's experience even at the time of verification of documents and what was produced was the relieving-cum-experience letter dated 27-8-2014 along with the application and on the basis of which it cannot be said that the original writ petitioner was having one year's experience is concerned, it is required to be noted that at the time of verification of the documents, the original writ petitioner was not informed/told that the letter dated 27-8-2014 is not sufficient to establish the essential requirement of one year's experience. The original writ petitioner was also not told/informed at the time of



verification of documents on 18-1-2016 that certificate of one year's experience is lacking.”

26. In the case of **Dheerender Singh Paliwal** (supra) in fact the Hon’ble Supreme Court was considering a case in which two candidates had been allowed to produce their caste certificates which were not in the prescribed performa initially but the appellant who was before the Hon’ble Supreme Court who had produced the original B.Sc/M.Sc. degree in Zoology and also submitted the attested photocopy of B.Sc. Zoology degree was not allowed to produce the required certificate. The Hon’ble Supreme Court held that the respondent Commission was unfair having regard to a very trivial issue, namely, a non-production of an added qualification as part of the essential qualification at the degree level which the appellant did possess and for mere asking, the appellant could have readily produced the same through his employer. Paragraph ‘15’ of the judgment in the case of **Dheerender Singh Paliwal** (supra) is quoted hereunder for a ready reference:-

“**15.** In the first place, it must be stated that it is not a case of the appellant not possessing the required essential qualifications but was of only not enclosing the certificate in proof of the added qualification of Zoology as one of the subjects at BSc level, from a recognised University. In the application when once the appellant, marked ‘1’ against Column 9 and thereby confirmed that he possesses the essential qualification, namely, the postgraduate qualification as well as the degree



level qualification, if at all there was any doubt about any of the qualification, the appellant should have been called upon to produce the required certificate in proof of such essential qualification. In fact in this context, when we refer to the interview proceedings of the appellant as well as two other candidates we find that the appellant produced the original BSc/MSc degree in Zoology and also submitted the attested photocopy of BSc Zoology degree. The outcome of the said interview was that the appellant should be cleared of his selection. Insofar as other two candidates, namely, Miss Babyto and Miss Imrana, are concerned, we find that the production of their caste certificate was not in the prescribed pro forma initially, nevertheless those candidates were allowed to produce the original caste certificate issued by the competent authority and after verifying the same by accepting the attested photocopies of such caste certificates, their cases were cleared. Therefore, when such a course was adopted by the respondent Commission in regard to those two candidates there is no reason why the candidature of the appellant alone was kept in suspension, though he also cleared interview process. Even assuming such clearance was not made awaiting the outcome of the order of the Tribunal, when the Tribunal upheld his selection and directed the respondent to issue necessary orders for appointment, in all fairness the respondent Commission should have issued the order of appointment. We are of the view that such an approach of the respondent Commission was unfair having regard to the very trivial issue, namely, a non-production of an added qualification as part of the essential qualification at the degree level which the appellant did possess and for mere asking, the appellant could have readily produced the same through his employer.”

In the present case, the fact is that on the date of application



and the interview the petitioner was not possessing the certificate.

27. In the case of **Gyan Prakash Srivastava** (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court was considering a case in which para 7(ii) of the advertisement specifically required submission of the degree in law of a recognized university or equivalent and the candidates were required to have a 12 years' experience as an advocate or as a Member of the State Judicial Service or equivalent experience in the Legal Department of the Central/State Government/UTs. The candidates were required to attach with their application the matriculation certificate and the degree or diploma certificate in support of their educational qualification. The respondent in the said case had got himself enrolled with the Bar Council of Uttar Pradesh and a certificate to that effect was issued by the Bar Council. He had attached with his application certificate issued by the Bar Council but did not attach his degree of LLB. The Union Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred as the 'Commission'), therefore, refused to entertain his application for the post of Legal Advisor-cum-Standing Counsel in Land and Building Department, Govt. of NCT of Delhi. The decision of the Commission was challenged before the Central Administrative Tribunal ('CAT') (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal'). The Tribunal took a view that the document enclosed by the respondent unmistakably show that he must be having a



degree of LLB. The decision of the Tribunal was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court. The challenge made before the learned Single Judge as well as the Hon'ble Division Bench of Delhi High Court failed. It was held that because the respondent had been enrolled with the Bar Council, therefore, it must be assumed that he had a valid LLB degree certificate. Ultimately, the appeal preferred by the Commission in the Hon'ble Supreme Court was dismissed.

28. At this stage, this Court is reminded of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd. and Anr. Vs. N.R. Vairamani and Anr.** reported in **(2004) 8 SCC 579** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that the judgments of the court are not to be cited like an Euclid's theorem because a slight change in the facts of the case would make a sea difference in the opinion of the court.

29. In the present case, this Court finds that the petitioner was fully aware of what he was required to do and what is the requirement under the advertisement. Admittedly, he was not possessing the required certificate and had not uploaded the same and he was not in possession thereof at the time of interview. He claims to have sent it by post and physically few days after the interview was over.

30. In such a case, if this Court exercises it's



extraordinary writ jurisdiction to interfere with the result published by the Commission, it may be done only by overreaching the clear stipulation present in the advertisement. This Court will refrain itself from doing so as it is well settled that the writ courts while exercising their power under Article 226 are guided by their own code of self-restraint. To this Court, it appears that any interference in this matter may create a bad precedent.

31. For the aforesaid reasons, this writ application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

Rajeev/sushma-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	22.09.2023
Transmission Date	

