

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4432 of 2017

=====

Puja Kumari Daughter of Ram Chandra Chaudhary, Resident of Jay Prakash Nagar, Ward No. 5, P.S. Madhepura, P.O. Madhepura, District Madhepura, Pin Code- 852113.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary cum Home Commissioner, Department of Home Prison, Government of Bihar, Pat
3. The Director General of Police, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Inspector General Jail and Reform Serivces, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Central Selection Board of Constable, Government of Bihar, through its Secretary, I.A.S. Colony
6. The Chairman, Central Selection Board of Constable, Government of Bihar, Patna. null null
7. The Secretary, Central Selection Board of Constable, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Md.N.H. Khan-SC1
		Mrs. Babita Kumari, AC to SC1
For the CSBC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Adv.
		Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra, Adv.
		Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

4 28-02-2025 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner, Learned Counsel for the State and Learned Counsel for the Central Selection Board of Constable (C.S.B.C.).

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of gross sympathy, due to the reason that at the time of filling of the application form for the post of Kakshpal under jail, mistake took place in filling the said form. The said mistake could not be rectified and during the document verification, her form has



been rejected.

3. Counsel further submits that the only mistake occurred that in place of B.C category, petitioner has wrongly inserted in the form as EBC category.

4. Counsel for the C.S.B.C. submits that the advertisement was made about 10 years back in which every candidate was supposed to fill up the form according to advertisement. He further submits that the said advertisement is of the year 2015 and entire process of selection had been completed including the written and final examination up-to 2017 and 8 years have already been lapsed.

5. In the light of the facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner as the petitioner herself has accepted the said mistake in filling of the form and process of advertisement has already been completed long back.

6. Accordingly, the present writ application stands dismissed as infructuous.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Prakashmani/-

U			
---	--	--	--

