

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10892 of 2025

=====

Kanchan Kumari, D/o Sanjay Kumar, Resident of Village-Manpur Pahani
Tola, P.S.-Buniyadganj, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Health, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director in Chief, Health Services, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Technical Service Commission, Bihar, Patna, through its Secretary.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sudhir Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. AC to AG
For the BTSC	:	Mr. Nikesh Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Akshansh Shanker, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 21-07-2025 Heard the parties.

2. At the outset, learned Advocate for the petitioner seeks permission to make necessary correction in the relief(s) portion of the writ petition in course of the day.

3. Permission is accorded.

4. The petitioner has invoked the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court seeking a direction upon the concerned respondent(s) to publish her result under the BC Category, which category she belongs, and had applied for the post of Bihar Female Medical Worker (A.N.M.) in the Department of Health in terms with Advertisement No.7/2022.



5. Thrust of the argument(s) led before this Court is in a narrow compass that the petitioner has submitted her application under BC Category for the post of A.N.M.; however, on account of inadvertence/mistake in place of 'BC' the word 'EBC' was noted while filling up online form, which led to non-acceptance of her candidature under BC Category, rather she has been treated as candidate under Unreserved Category. Had the petitioner been treated under BC Category, she would have been qualified in the examination as she secured the cut off marks under that category.

6. Learned Advocate for the Bihar Technical Service Commission has submitted that there is a clear stipulation in the Advertisement No.7/2022 that in case there shall be any mistake at the time of filling online application, candidate(s) shall not be allowed to make any correction at the time of counselling.

7. Referring to Annexure-P/4 (acknowledgment receipt), the copy of which has been placed at page-15 to the writ petition, learned Advocate for the Commission further contended that the petitioner had already been informed that she filled up her form under EBC Category but at the time of verification of certificate, she produced certificate of BC Category and, as such, her candidature was treated under



Unreserved Category. Objection of the petitioner has also been turned down vide Annexure-P/4 by the Bihar Technical Service Commission. The entire exercise has been done long back in the month of February, 2024; however, the present writ petition came to be filed after a delay of more than one year four months.

8. Having considered the submissions set forth by the learned Advocate for the parties, this Court finds that the terms of the advertisement, in no circumstances, can be diluted and modified, which will affect the entire selection process, rather in all fairness, it is to be abide by all, unless it is held to be unreasonable. Apart from the aforesaid fact, there is apparent delay in approaching this Court for redressal of the grievance. For both the counts, this Court does not find merit in the present writ petition. Accordingly, it stands dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

