

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8079 of 2018

Manjee Yadav S/o Savru Yadav, Resident of Village-Balea, Rajpur, P.S.
Simari, District-Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India
2. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Group Centre, C.R.P.F. at Muzaffarpur Bihar.
3. The Inspector General of Police, C.R.P.F. Bihar Sector at Patna.
4. The Deputy Inspector General of Police Recruitment Director General Officer, C.R.P.F, New Delhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ramakant Yadav, Adv.
For the UOI : None

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

5 03-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State. No one appears on behalf of Union of India, though counter affidavit filed by the Union is on record.

2. The present writ petition has been filed directing the respondents with regard to reconsideration of the order dated 08.01.2018 issued by respondent No.3, by which application of petitioner was refused of Police (Technical Tradesman) Recruitment 2016/17.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has appeared in the recruitment process for the post of Constable (Technical Tradesman) Recruitment 2016/17. Learned counsel further submits that driving license has been



issued to the petitioner from Assistant Regional Transport Office at Gazipur, U.P. dated 7.12.2019. Learned counsel next submits that the petitioner appeared in the examination and got 54 marks but not selected but those who got 45 marks were selected. Learned counsel further submits that the candidature of the petitioner was refused on the ground that his driving license issued by D.T.O. office is not genuine. Learned counsel further submits that there were 3 persons, namely, Vijay Shankar, Ravi Ranjan Mishra and Deepak Kumar Yadav have obtained the driving licence from the same D.T.O. office. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is requested for re-verification of his document. He submits that in the counter affidavit, particularly in paragraph 11, the stand taken by the Union is that the writ petition is pre-mature and fit to be dismissed due to the reason that the re-verification of petitioner's document is under process. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that Annexure-C has been attached in the counter by which letter has been communicated from the respondent officials to the District Transport Office, Gazipur, U.P. with regard to re-verification of his license.

4. It transpired to this Court that there is subsistence in the statement made in the counter affidavit as the petitioner to



restrain himself from filing the writ petition till the report demanded by the officials of CRPF contained in Annexure-C himself not be received.

5. In this view of the matter, this Court hereby directs to the officials of the CRPF to take appropriate action only after receiving of report of CRPF contained in Annexure-C from the District Transport Office, Gazipur, U.P.

6. It is made clear that if the certificate has been found correct then the petitioner's appointment is directed to be accepted but in case if it is found that negative response has come then in that case, official of CRPF is directed to take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

7. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

sanjeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

