

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17026 of 2023

=====

Rajeev Kumar Son of Bhaso Paswan, Resident of Ward No. 09, Mor, P.S.-
Mokama, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. I.G. of Police, Head Quarter, Bihar, Patna.
4. D.I.G. of Police Saran Range, Chapra.
5. S.P. Siwan.
6. Chairman, Central Selection Board (Constable Selection) Bihar, Patna.
7. Special Works Officer, Central Selection Board (Constable Selection) Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Y.V. Giri, Sr. Advocate Mr. Ram Hriday Prasad Ms. Maruti Kumari
For the State	:	Mr. Suman Kr. Jha (AC to AAG3)
For the CSBC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL
ORAL ORDER

5 05-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner was selected for the post of Constable. He also passed the medical test as well as the other formalities. However, he has not been permitted to join the services as it was found as against the petitioner that one Mokama P.S. Case No. 280 of 2018 for the offences punishable under Sections 147,



148, 149, 323, 325, 307 and 379 of the Indian Penal Code has been registered, which has not been disclosed by the petitioner while filing the character verification form. Referring to the judgment passed by the Trial Court i.e. Anneuxre-5 dated 03.07.2023, he further submits that after conclusion of trial, the learned Trial Court acquitted the applicant from all the charges levelled against him, therefore, on this ground, the applicant is entitled to get his appointment. He further submits that the matter of the petitioner is squarely covered with the observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Ravindra Kumar Versus State of Uttar Pradesh and Others*** reported in ***2024 (5) SCC 264*** and also squarely covered with the judgment passed by this Court in the case of ***Manoranjan Kumar Vrs. State of Bihar and Others*** passed in **C.W.J.C. No. 7853 of 2024**. He lastly submits that the petitioner after getting acquittal already made his representation before the respondents i.e. Annexure-7 dated 19.09.2023 but no decision has been taken by the respondents as yet.

3. The learned counsel for the State submits that since the material fact has been concealed by the petitioner, therefore on this ground he has rightly not been granted order of appointment.



4. Considering the submissions made by the counsels, it would appropriate to dispose of the writ petition at this stage directing the concerned respondent no. 2 to consider and decide the pending representation, Annexure nos.- 7, 8 and 9, with the specific period fixed by this Court.

5. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

6. The respondent no. 2 is directed to consider and decide the pending representation of the petitioner i.e. Annexure nos-7, 8 and 9 as early as possible probably within 60 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order in accordance with relevant rules and law and further taking into consideration the observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court as in the cases as referred hereinabove.

7. However, petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court, if occasion will arise subsequently.

(Arvind Singh Chandel , J)

shailendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

