

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6208 of 2025

=====

Satyendra Kumar, Son of Nagendra Prasad, Resident of- Pipra, P.S. Darpa,
District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, East Champaran.
4. The Block Development officer, Sangrampur, East Champaran.
5. The Block Panchayat Raj Officer, Sangrampur, East Champaran.
6. Krishna Kumar, Son of Premchand Prasad, Resident of Khijirpura, Chakia, P.S. Kesariya, P.O. Nayagoan, District- East Champaran Pin Code-845424

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ayush Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to SC-25

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 24-04-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner was one of the aspirant for the post of Panchayat Secretary under Employment Notice No. 826, on being aggrieved with the rejection list issued by the Block Development Officer, Sangrampur, East Champaran to the extent it related to the petitioner, has preferred the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Ayush Kumar, learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that on being found eligible the petitioner applied for the post of Secretary Gram Kutchary on contractual basis pursuant to Employment Notice No. 826 dated 15.01.2025. Taking this Court through the advertisement, the



copy of which is marked as Annexure P/1, it is vehemently contended that as per the terms of the advertisement, the eligibility criteria for a candidate was Intermediate(10+2) passed or equivalent qualification. Moreover, Clause 5(A) of the aforesaid notice explicitly made it clear that an applicant can apply against one Panchayat of each Block. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner submitted application form for the aforesaid post in different Panchayat of different Blocks, the particulars of which has been mentioned in paragraph no. 9. Having found eligible and more meritorious, the name of the petitioner finds at serial number one in the select list of North Bariyariya Panchayat under B.C. category, whereas the name of the private respondent no. 6 finds place at serial no. 2.

4. Notwithstanding the aforesaid fact, all of a sudden the rejection list came to be published, wherein the name of the petitioner figured with the remark that the petitioner has applied in more than one Block. It is the specific contention of the petitioner that in the employment notice there was no such stipulation mentioned; hence the very rejection of the candidature of the petitioner was wholly unjustified and illegal.

5. Learned Advocate for the State dispelling the aforesaid contention has submitted that the employment notice, specially Clause 5(क), clearly stipulates that the applicant can



apply online only under one Panchayat of any of the Block; hence, the candidature of the petitioner, who applied against different Panchayat under different Block has rightly been rejected.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of learned Advocate for the parties and after going through the terms of the advertisement, this Court deems it appropriate to quote Clause 5(क) -

“5. (क) आवेदक के द्वारा किसी एक प्रखंड के एक पंचायत में ऑनलाईन आवेदन किया जा सकता है।”

Bare perusal of Clause 5(क), there is no iota of confusion that a candidate was required to apply online against the post of Secretary Gram Kutchary, for one Panchayat of any of the Block. Any, otherwise, interpretation of the said clause is, *per se*, unwarranted.

7. In view of the specific stipulation in the advertisement, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition, accordingly the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

