

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14148 of 2023

Hitendra Kumar Singh Son of Ram Parikha Singh, R/o village- Patanawa, P.S.
- Jamhore, District - Aurangabad (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Science and Technology Dept. Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Science and Technology Dept. Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Bihar Public Service Commission, through its Chairman, 15 Nehru Path, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, 15 Nehru Path, (Bailey Road) Patna.
6. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, 15 Nehru Path, (Bailey Road) Patna.
7. The Officer on Special Duty, Bihar Public Service Commission, 15 Nehru Path, (Bailey Road) Patna.
8. The Examination Controller, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Kameshwar Pd. Gupta, GP-10
		Ms. Deepanjali Gupta, AC to GP-10
For the B.P.S.C.	:	Ms. Parul Prasad, Advocate
		Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 12-12-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. This writ application has been filed for quashing the final result dated 18.03.2023 published by the Examination Controller, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna (Respondent No. 8) for appointment of Lecturer Civil Engineering in Government Polytechnic/Government Women Polytechnic Colleges of the State of Bihar and further for issuance of a direction upon the respondent-authorities to



appoint the petitioner on the post of Lecturer, Civil Engineering in any Government Polytechnic Colleges/Government Women Colleges in the State of Bihar giving him the benefit of disability as petitioner is 40 per cent disabled by his eyes.

3. In this case, a counter-affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent-B.P.S.C.. In Paragraph No. 8 of the said counter-affidavit it is stated that though the petitioner claims to be eligible for the said post under the quota of disabled candidates but when the Medical Board examined the petitioner, he was not found to be visually impaired and, therefore, he was not given the benefit of reservation for the disabled candidates. The decision of the Medical Board has also been annexed as Annexure-R/3 to the counter-affidavit filed on the behalf of Respondent Nos. 4 to 8.

4. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any merit in the instant writ application.

5. Accordingly, the instant writ application is dismissed.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

U			
---	--	--	--

