

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19291 of 2024

=====

Kamaldev Roy, Son of Baladev Roy, Resident of Village- Koshlipatti,
Panchayat- Ramnagar, Ward No.- 15, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul, Bihar-
852108.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Bihar.
4. The Director General -cum- Commandant General, Home Guard and Fire Services, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Supaul, District- Supaul.
6. The Commandant Bihar Home Guard, At Supaul, District- Supaul.
7. The District Selection Committee, through the Chairman cum District Magistrate, Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Giri, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar, AC to GP-16

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 07-01-2025 Heard Mr. Jitendra Kumar Giri, learned Advocate for

the petitioner and Mr. Jitendra Kumar, learned Advocate for the

State.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking a
direction upon the concerned respondents to consider the case of
the petitioner for the post of Home Guard in relation to
Advertisement No. 01/2006 or 02/2011, in terms of which the
petitioner had applied for empanelment as Home Guard in the
District of Supaul.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner has contended that despite the petitioner having requisite qualification his case has not been considered. He further contended that the qualification mentioned in the Advertisement No. 01 of 2006 were changed in the joint Advertisement No. 01/2006 and 02/2011.

4. Learned Advocate for the State submits that in absence of necessary facts and the pleadings, the writ petition must not be entertained.

5. This Court has gone through the averments made in the writ petition, however, there is no specific materials and the necessary facts to substantiate the claim. Further, there is no disclosure as to what was the qualification which was changed subsequently.

6. Having considered the submissions and after going through the averments made in the writ petition, this Court is of the opinion that while approaching the High Court under Article 226 of Constitution, the petitioner must disclose all the relevant necessary facts in his writ petition. Non-disclosure of the relevant and material facts, the writ petition may be dismissed at the threshold.

76. At this juncture, learned Advocate for the petitioner submits

that the grievance of the petitioner would be redressed, if he may be allowed to approach before the authority concerned.

8. Taking note of the prayer of the petitioner, the writ petition stands disposed of with a liberty aforesaid.

9. Suffice it to observe that if the petitioner files a proper representation with all the details preferably within a period of four weeks from today, the respondent authorities shall consider the same and dispose of within a further period of twelve weeks.

(Harish Kumar, J.)

Jyoti Kumari/-

U			
---	--	--	--