

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.660 of 2021

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.194 of 2021

=====

Deepak Kumar Son of Late Ram Pravesh Rai, Resident of Mohalla-Mishri Toli, Bastikorar Mauna Chapara, P.S.-Town Chhapra, District-Chhapara (Saran).

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Education Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Controller of Examination (Miscellaneous) Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
3. The Director/Prabandhak ION Digital Zone Phulwarisharif Opposite Canara Bank, Cheditola Near AIIMS Phulwarisharif, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Patna.
5. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Patna.
6. The Block Education Officer, Phulwarisharif, District-Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Upendra Kumar Singh
For the State	:	Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, AC to AAG15
For the BSEB	:	M/s Lalit Kishore, Sr. Advocate Gyan Shankar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 09-10-2023

1. The appellant was aggrieved with the selection made to the post of Panchayat Teacher in Primary School, Muraudpur, Block-Garakha in the district of Saran. One of the essential requirements for appointment was qualification in the State Teachers Eligibility Test. The appellant had applied for the same and participated in the State Teachers Eligibility



Test conducted on 18.9.2020. The appellant was declared unsuccessful. The appellant's contention is that there was some problem in the computer system and there was much rattling which prevented the appellant from participating in the test properly.

3. The learned Single Judge specifically found that the complaint made to the Bihar School Examination Board was followed up and response was received from the agency which had conducted the test. The agency had obtained information from the Centre, from which the test was attempted by the appellant and had also placed on record that he had attempted 43 questions out of 50 in the general test and in the subject test he had attempted only 55 questions out of 100.

4. There were no complaints raised from any other persons who appeared for the examination in the centre. The appellant had complained before the results were declared but after the examination. The complaint was considered but the same found to be devoid of merit.

5. We find from the response of the agency which conducted the test that no such mishap occurred. In any event the contention that the examination itself should be cancelled and the petitioner treated to have passed in the test



cannot be countenanced.

6. We find no reason to entertain the appeal and
dismiss the same.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Spd/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	11.10.2023
Transmission Date	NA

