

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3138 of 2025

=====

Jyoti Joshi, D/o Ashok Kumar Joshi, R/o Near Suz Factory, PPCL Colony,
Dehri-on-Sone, District- Rohtas at present Near Saraswati Vidyalaya, Dhanraj
Singh Path, Punaichak, Bailey Road, Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bihar Public Service Commission through its Chairman, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Additional Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Jawaharlal Nehru Marg, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jagannath Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (23)
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 21-01-2026



This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner Jyoti

Joshi with the following prayer:-

- “1. For issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, rule, direction commanding the respondent Bihar Public Service Commission to allot the marks against the questions for which the petitioner has given correct answer but has not been allotted the marks by the Commission not even zero marks, if the answer was incorrect and in this way total marks granted to the petitioner in written test was 456 plus 60 marks allotted in the interview which comes to 516 out of cut off marks 517 in unreserved category when the petitioner's correct answer against question no. 1(a) & (b) only 2 marks has been allotted out of 4 marks and against question no. 7 having total 10 marks out of five questions 2 marks each was to be allotted where the petitioner has answered total 5 questions out of which four answers were correct and therefore, she was entitled for 8 marks but has been allotted only 3 marks in total likewise against the question no. 10 the total number of question was five with 1 marks against each question out of which the petitioner answered question no. 10(a) correctly and therefore, entitled for 1 mark where the answer-sheet reflects that the answer has been found to be correct but no marks has been allotted where the petitioner was entitled for one mark and against question no. 18 there were total ten questions for 1 marks each and the petitioner has correctly answered question no. 18(k) but no marks has been*



allotted. If the answer was wrong then at least 0 mark should have been indicated but nothing has been allotted which is reflective from page 17 of the answer-sheet where the petitioner has been allotted only 456 marks and if these 8 numbers against the correct answers would have been allotted then total marks obtained by the petitioner would have been 464 marks and if it would have been added with 60 marks allotted to the petitioner in interview then a total marks obtained by the petitioner would have been 524 where the cut off marks for general category was 517 only with a view to declare her fail resultantly she could not be selected and recommended for appointment against the vacancies of 30th Bihar Judicial Service Competitive Exam conducted in the year 2019 and therefore, the respondent authorities may be directed to recommend the name of the petitioner after inclusion of marks against correct answer and she should be given appointment in 30th Bihar Judicial Service as the persons who have obtained only 517 marks have been appointed and accordingly merit list should be revised and the name of the petitioner should be placed at appropriate place.”

2. Since the result of the examination was published in the year 2019 and recommendation was made on 02.12.2019, this petition suffers from gross laches as the same has been filed in the year 2025. Even the persons who have been selected have not been arrayed as party and therefore, we are not inclined to



entertain this writ petition.

3. The writ petition stands dismissed.

4. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Sangam Kumar Sahoo, CJ)

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

P.K.P./-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	22.01.2026
Transmission Date	

