

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10858 of 2025

Dr. Harish Kumar S/o Shri Bal Krishan, C/o Shri Bal Krishan Pandey Gali
Mithanpura, Muzaffarpur, Bihar-842002.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chairman Bihar State University Commission, Patna, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mrigank Mauli, Advocate Mr. Sanket, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Additional Advocate General (9) Mr. Anil Kumar Verma, AC to AAG-9
For the BSUSC	:	Mr. Anjani Kumar, Sr. Advocate Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-07-2025

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner is an unreserved category candidate who has filed this writ petition seeking a direction to the respondents/ the Bihar State University Service Commission, (hereinafter referred as ‘Commission’), to allow the petitioner to participate in the interview scheduled on 8th and 9th July, 2025 for the post of Assistant Professor, Sanskrit in terms of the advertisement No. AP-SANS-06/20-21 dated 21.09.2020.

3. Learned counsel for the Commission has submitted that the cut off marks for the unreserved category is 83 and the petitioner has scored only 73 marks during the shortlisting of the candidates, as a result of which he has not been called for the interview.

4. The case of the petitioner as set out in the writ petition is that the petitioner has not been awarded 10 marks each, earmarked for the research paper published and the teaching experience, respectively,

5. Insofar as the teaching experience is concerned it is evident from the record that teaching experience certificate submitted by the petitioner has not been countersigned by the Registrar of the University, which is the requirement as per the advertisement dated 21.09.2020 issued by the Commission. Learned advocate for the petitioner, therefore, has submitted that he does not press the issue of non awarding of marks to the petitioner in the category of teaching experience.

6. Insofar as the marks relating to research publication is concerned, it is the case of the petitioner that the Commission has not awarded any marks to the petitioner despite the entire five sets of research paper publication made by the petitioner was submitted to the Commission.

7. Learned counsel for the Commission has produced the original set of the application submitted by the petitioner wherein, it has been found that the petitioner had submitted only the two pages each of the research publication made by the petitioner, and not the complete research paper published by the

petitioner. Learned counsel for the Commission, therefore, contended that it is in that view of the matter that no marks was awarded to the petitioner in the category of research paper.

8. Since the petitioner did not submit the entire sets of research publication made to the petitioner, no marks, therefore, could have been awarded to the petitioner in the research publication.

9. Under the circumstances, if no marks could have been awarded to the petitioner in the category research publication, the score of the petitioner would remain at 73, which is far below the cut off marks of 83 prescribed by the Commission.

10. Accordingly no direction can be given to the Commission to allow the petitioner to participate in the interview for the post of Assistant Professor, Sanskrit in terms of the advertisement dated 21.09.2020.

11. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Nishant/-

U			
---	--	--	--