

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10296 of 2025

=====

Bineeta Kumari W/o Pankaj Kumar Mandal, Resident of Village-Gowabakhar, P.S.-Banka, District-Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Home Department, Government of Bihar.
2. The Director General of Home Guard Force, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Banka, Bihar.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Banka, Bihar.
5. The District Commandant, Home Guard Force, Banka, Bihar.
6. The District Development Officer, Banka, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Akash Keshav, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Mandal, SC 3
		Ms. Neelam Kumari, AC to SC 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 07-07-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner, who is one of the aspirants for the post of Home Guard in relation to Advertisement No. 01/2025 published on 21.03.2025, has approached this Court on being aggrieved with the action of the respondent, especially the recruiting agency who failed to consider the discrepancies took place during the selection procedure of Home Guard conducted on 28.05.2025.

3. It is the specific contention of the petitioner that on 28.05.2025 she was directed to appear in the physical test



where she qualified all the physical test except high Jump. On being dissatisfied the manner in which the score was awarded, the petitioner immediately filed a representation on 29.05.2025 itself before all the authorities concerned, including the District Magistrate, Buxar for re conducting her physical efficiency test after watching videography, as had been done by the recruiting agency at the time of physical efficiency test. It has fairly been contended that during the pendency of the writ petition, now the merit list has also been published, however, till date representation/objection filed by the petitioner did not even take note of.

4. Learned Advocate for the State while refuting the prayer has submitted that now the merit list has been published, any interference by this Court shall hamper the selection process.

5. Having considered the limited grievance of the petitioner and the fact that soon after the physical efficiency test, the petitioner has made an objection by filing a detailed representation, at least in the opinion of this Court, the same is required to be taken note of and brought to its logical conclusion.

6. In view thereof, this Court directs the



respondent No. 5 to verify the averments made in the representation/objection, the copy of which placed on record, and dispose off the same within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

7. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	08.07.2025
Transmission Date	

