

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1576 of 2018

=====

Aditya Raj, Son of Ramshankar Mahto, Resident of Manjhaul-2, Tola-Tilak
Nagar, P.O.-Manjhaul, P.S. Cheriya Bariapur, District-Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Home, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Home, Government of India, New Delhi.
3. The DGP, CRPF Headquarter, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
4. The DIGP CRPF Recruitment, Headquarter Directorate, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
5. The DIGP, CRPF, Group Centre Mokamahghat, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajey Kumar, Advocate
For the Union Of India : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sinha, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

7 31-10-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for Union Of India are present.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on
06.10.2023 due to casualty taken place in his family he could
not appear before this Court and on the submissions made by
the learned counsel for the Union of India, order has been
passed for the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs. 25,000/- as
accepted voluntarily. He also submits that the actual position is
otherwise.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits
that from paragraph 11 of the counter affidavit, it is clear that



due to mistake taken place in the excel sheet i.e. marks mentioned against serial no. 608 actually belongs to serial no. 607 and so on, up to the serial no. 637. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the roll number of the petitioner was 630, therefore, in the excel sheet, the place of roll number changed, but there is no net effect due to the reason that all roll numbers including the petitioner also obtained 158 marks only.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that on the mark-sheet, there is no effect, but it is true that due to the mistake of the data entry operator, one roll number has been shifted.

5. In this view of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that there is no need for the petitioner to make further payment and since there is no any benefit of the calculation in the mark-sheet available to the petitioner, this writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

