

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14829 of 2013

=====

Rituranjan Kr. Singh S/O Rajeshwar Singh Resident Of Village- Rohara,
Kala, P.S- Badhariya, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Commissioner, Saran, at Chapra.
3. District Magistrate, Siwan.
4. Deputy Development Commissioner, Siwan.
5. Sub- Divisional Officer, Siwan.
6. Chairman, Siwan Zila Parishad, Siwan.
7. Deputy Chairman, Siwan Zila Parishad, Siwan.
8. Dig Vijay Mani Tiwary S/O Sashi Bhushan Tiwary Resident Of Vill P.S-
Pachrukhi, District-Siwan.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Pravin Kumar, Adv.
For the Zila Parishad, Siwan	:	Mr. Dhananjay Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

9 16-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Zila Parishad,
Siwan.

2. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a
direction to the respondents to appoint the petitioner to the post
of Junior Engineer, and further prayer has been made for the
cancellation of the appointment of Respondent No. 8, who is
alleged to have been illegally selected by the respondents. The
petitioner has also prayed for any other relief to which he may



be found entitled.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, pursuant to the advertisement published in the Hindi daily *Hindustan* dated 30.10.2012, bearing Advertisement No. 1/12-13, the petitioner applied for the post of Junior Engineer in Zila Parishad, Siwan, on a contractual basis. Counsel further submits that although the petitioner secured more marks than Respondent No. 8, and both fall under the general category, Respondent No. 8 was selected, while the petitioner was not selected. It is also submitted that the petitioner filed a representation on 11.01.2013, however, the same has not been considered by the concerned authorities.

4. Learned counsel for the Zila Parishad, Siwan submits that marks alone were not the sole criterion for selection, rather, other parameters were also considered and due to this reason the Respondent No. 8 was selected, while the petitioner was not selected. Counsel fairly submits that, from the pleadings, the petitioner's representation is still pending and no decision has yet been taken by the concerned authorities.

5. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, and in view of the submissions made above, the present writ petition stands disposed off with a direction to the petitioner to



file a fresh representation before the concerned authority of the Zila Parishad, in light of the advertisement and the selection result, within 30 days from today.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not entered into the merits of the case. The concerned authority of the Zila Parishad, shall consider and decide the petitioner's representation completely in accordance with law, within 90 days from the date of production/receipt of a copy of this order.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Aman Kumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

