

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16762 of 2025

=====

Jitendra Kumar Son of Shri Sunil Singh Resident of Village- Jat Dumari, P.S.-
Punpun, District- Patna, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through its Secretary, Department of Railway, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, Department of Railway, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
3. The Chairman, Railway and Recruitment Board (RRB), Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh.
4. The Secretary, Railway and Recruitment Board (RRB), Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh.
5. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, East Coast Railway, Waltair, Vishakapatnam.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Saurav Singh, Advocate Mr. Abhimanyu Deo, Advocate Mr. Samir Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Additional Solicitor General

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has filed the instant application for
the following relief(s) :-

*“(i) To issue an appropriate writ(s),
order(s), direction(s) in the nature of writ
of certiorari to set aside the Order passed
against the petitioner vide letter no.
RRBA/Con/Debar/ALP/1/1/11/2013 dated
10.02.2014 wherein the respondents have
cancelled the petitioner candidature for the
post of Assistant Loco Pilot, Cat-01 of CEN
No. 1/2011 and also had debarred the
petitioner from all RRB examinations for
appointment in Railways for Lifetime.*



(ii) To issue an appropriate writ(s), order(s), direction(s) in the nature of writ of certiorari to set aside the initiation of proceeding against the petitioner vide letter no.WAT/EL/RSO/D&A/2025/JK/SALP/542 dated 16.07.2025 regarding fraudulent appointment in railways and Sri G.R Mohan. CLI, CLI/SCMN has been nominated as Inquiry Officer.

(iii) To issue an appropriate writ(s), order(s), direction(s) in the nature of writ of mandamus directing the respondent authorities of Railways for not removing the petitioner based on such false accusations.

(iv) Any other relief which the petitioner may deemed to be found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the Union of India submits that the instant application is not maintainable in this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution but should have been filed before the Tribunal under the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

4. Having heard the objection of learned counsel for the respondents and after some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this application.

5. This application is disposed of as withdrawn.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

