

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13328 of 2024

=====

Suraj Bharatdwaj Son of Bhupal Rajak resident of village- Maranchi Gandhi
Tola, P.S. - Maranchi, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary Law Department Government of Bihar.
2. The Convenor, Centralized Selection and Appointment Committee- cum- District and Sessions Judge, Patna.
3. The Registrar General, Patna High Court, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Prasad, Adv.
For the High Court	:	Mr. Satyabir Bharti, Adv. Mr. Kanupriya, Adv. Mr. Abhishek Anand, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Kinkar Kumar (SC-9) Ms. Sushmita Sharma (AC to SC-9)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 05-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

counsel for the state and learned counsel for the respondent nos.

2 & 3.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for setting
aside the decision of Convenor, Centralized Selection
Appointment Committee-Cum-District and Sessions Judge,
Patna contained in memo no. 469 dated 29.07.2024 by which
the representation of the petitioner dated 18.06.2024 demanding
another chance to appear in the interview in connection with
appointment to the post of Court Reader-Cum-Deposition Writer
pursuant to employment notice no. 03 of 2022 has been rejected.



3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appeared in the examination process pursuant to employment notice 03/20222 for the concerned post. He has qualified in PT examination and thereafter, admit card was issued to him for written examination. In pursuant to the same, he appeared in the written examination. He was declared qualified in written examination and, thereafter, admit card was also issued to appear in the skill test to be held on 09.05.2024. Counsel further submits that the candidates were advised to keep visiting the website of Civil Court Patna for detail but after lapse of interview date, the petitioner received the information that he was selected for interview and time for interview has lapsed. Therefore, he has filed representation before the Convenor, Centralized Selection Appointment Committee which was rejected and the rejection order has been challenged before this Hon'ble Court in this writ petition stating that the petitioner is a very poor person residing in village where internet and mobile are not functioning and thus, he could not appear in the interview in the absence of information. The petitioner has taken the plea that one candidate Mr. Rahul Raushan has been granted liberty to appear in the examination process, subsequently, after the date of interview but the petitioner's representation has been



rejected.

4. Counsel for the State submits that the matter is directly relating to respondent Nos. 2 & 3.

5. Counsel for respondent nos. 2 & 3 submits that the petitioner has not appeared in the interview. Counsel submits that it has been categorically accepted by the petitioner himself that instruction was given to the candidates to visit the website of Civil Court, Patna for details but petitioner failed to visit the website and it is due to this fault, he could not appear in the interview. Counsel further submits that his representation was considered and by a reasoned order, his representation was rejected. Counsel for state further submits that the case of one Rahul Raushan is different from the case of the petitioner. Counsel further submits that the case of Rahul Raushan is based on the ground that his biometric verification could not take place. It is due to technical mistake, he could not appear in the interview and therefore, fresh date for interview has been fixed whereas the case of petitioner is different that he has not acted upon in the light of the information provided on the website to appear in the interview.

6. In the light of the submissions made by the parties, it transpires to this Court that in the present era when computer



and internet are available throughout India, mobile and internet are extremely usable by the persons, even the form has been filled up by the petitioner through online mode and he is well aware by the condition that his result and everything shall come on website, he has not opted to appear and subsequently after end of interview, he has filed this writ petition to fix fresh date to appear in interview.

7. In view of this Court, every organization has to maintain discipline as without discipline, development and growth is impossible, hence, granting permission in such a situation shall open a flood gate.

8. In this view of the matter, this Court is inclined to interfere in this matter. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Amandeep/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

