

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1953 of 2020

=====

Satish Kumar Son of Shree Narayan Mahto Resident of Village and P.O.-
Dhanama, P.S.- Chandradeep, District- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary Human Resources Development Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Public Service Commission Through its Chairman, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Secretary Bihar Public Service Commission, Bihar, Patna.
5. The Joint Secretary- cum- Examination Controller Bihar Public Service Commission, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prakash Mahto
For the State	:	Mr. Prabhakar Jha (Gp7)
For the B.P.S.C.	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 15-07-2024

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the State and learned counsel for the B.P.S.C.

2. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the
following reliefs:

“(I) For issuance of appropriate writ(s), order(s), direction(s) commanding the respondents for cancelling the result dated 25.05.2019 and amended result dated 21.08.2019 against advertisement No. 53/2014 for appointment of Assistant Professor in History under different Universities of State of Bihar.

(II) For commanding the University Respondents to award almost minimum marks. i.e. 07 in interview to the petitioner who has awarded only 02 marks whereas out of 30 candidates of the B.C. Category (05) 16 candidates who have lesser Academic Marks than the petitioner have been awarded Maximum 12 marks and minimum 7 marks and 91 candidates of General Category (01) who have lesser marks



to the petitioner given 14 maximum marks and minimum 7 marks in interview by the concerned authority.

(III) For direction to take fresh Interview under Videography and publish his result as per fresh amended marks of the petitioner.

(IV) For granting other relief or reliefs to the petitioner for which he is legally entitled.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner applied for appointment on the post of Assistant Professor in History against the Advertisement No. 53/2014. He further submits that the petitioner has secured academic marks (62.5) and the cut off marks of General category is 68.15 and B.C. category is 66.10. The petitioner belongs to B.C. category but in the interview he has been awarded only 2 marks, therefore, he disqualified.

4. Learned counsel for the B.P.S.C. submits that the marks in interview is awarded by Interview Board as per the performance of the candidates. The petitioner was awarded marks in the interview according to his performance before the Interview Board. He further submits that the members of the Interview Board do not have any knowledge regarding academic marks obtained by the candidates, so they purely judge a candidate on the basis of his performance in the interview. He also submits that the petitioner has come with irrelevant allegations only on account of failure and frustration. The Interview Board consists of member of the Commission and



experts such as senior most retired/working Professors/Associate Professors from all over the country. Therefore, the allegation of influencing the Interview Board is completely unfounded and baseless.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the fact that the present writ petition is devoid of any merit, accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16.07.2024
Transmission Date	NA

