

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4726 of 2020

=====

Bhupendra Mahto Son of Suresh Praasd Mahato @ Suresh Mahato, Resident
of Village-Musapur, P.S.-Korha, District-Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the D.G.P., Bihar, Patna.
2. The Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment) Bihar, Patna through
its Secretary.
3. The Chairman, The Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment), Bihar,
Patna.
4. The Secretary, The Central Selection Board (Constable Recruitment), Bihar,
Patna.
5. The Chairman, Constable Selection Board, through the S.P. Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Shasi Priya Pathak, Adv Ms. Sweta Baranwal
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.P.K. Verma (Aag3)
For the CSBC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra Mr. Vivek Anand

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 09-05-2024 Learned counsel for the petitioner and counsel for
the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for directing the respondent authorities to consider the case of the petitioner had declare the result, pursuant to the first round of Physical Evaluation Test and appoint the petitioner as constable against quota of current vacancies for Non-Home Guard candidates advertised through Advertisement No. 2 of 2009, published in the newspaper on 11.12.2009.

3. Counsel for the State raised preliminary objection and submits that the petitioner has filed rejoinder to the counter



affidavit. In the rejoinder, the petitioner has relied on the Judgment passed by this Court vide order dated 12.08.2014 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 15487 of 2011 with analogous cases. He submits that in the light of the said decision passed by this Hon'ble Court, the entire result which was published earlier has been examined under the committee headed by chairman as Director General of Police, Patna and Second list has been published. By virtue of the said list, total appointment of 1248 candidate has been taken place and 60 candidate were found ineligible.

4. Counsel submits that the petitioner was neither selected in the earlier list nor in the latter list. He has specifically pleaded in the counter affidavit that the number obtained by the petitioner was 21 whereas cutt off marks of his category was 66, as such, he was not selected.

5. In this view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the present case. Accordingly this writ petition is disposed off

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

