

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case no.1915 of 2017

=====

Kundan Mishra Son of Hareram Mishra Resident of Village - Bhadauni, P.O.
and P.S.- Nawada, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Secretary, Staff Selection Commission, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Bihar Agriculture Management and Training Institute,
Department of Agriculture, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Nawada.
5. The District Agriculture Officer, Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar Verma, Advocate Mr. Devendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Nilotpall Sharma, AC to GP 21 Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

5 19.01.2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has filed the instant application
for the following reliefs:

*“(i) To direct the Respondents to appoint the
petitioner on the post of Agriculture Coordinator
in pursuance of the Memo no. 423/A dated
17.02.2016 issued by the Staff Selection
Commission, State of Bihar;
(ii) To direct the Respondents to consider the
case of the petitioner on the same footing as that
of the temporary Agriculture Coordinator;
(iii) To direct the Respondents to give weightage*



to the five experience of the petitioner in his appointment.

(iv) To grant any other relief/reliefs for which the petitioners are found to be entitled under the facts and circumstances of case.”

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he was working as a *Kisan Salahkar* in *Jhunathi Panchayat* of Nawada Block in the district of Nawada on 29.1.2011 on the basis of temporary honorarium and has been working on the said post continuously. At this time, on the respondents Staff Selection Commission coming out an advertisement for selection of Agriculture Coordinator, the petitioner applied for the said post. He was called for verification of certificate and counseling, wherein he appeared with all the relevant documents, however, he was surprised not to find his name in the final list of selected candidates published by the Staff Selection Commission. Hence the instant writ application.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was working as a *Kisan Salahkar* under the District Agriculture Officer, Nawada and a certificate to that effect dated 20.5.2015 has been brought on record as Annexure-3 to the writ application. As such, it is submitted that the respondents committed an error in not giving weightage of the work done by the petitioner. The same be given and the



petitioner be appointed as Agriculture Coordinator.

5. The application is opposed by learned counsel for the Staff Selection Commission. It is submitted that as per Clause-7 of the advertisement (Annexure- 4), while the marks on the basis of having obtained a graduate degree was 70, a weightage of a maximum of 30 marks was to be given for work experience. It is further submitted that the Members of the Staff Selection Commission in its meeting dated 27.7.2016 having dealt with the issue, came to the conclusion that the weightage for the work done is to be given only to those applicants who had worked as Assistant Technical Manager, Block Technical Manager, Agriculture Coordinator on contract basis and subject matter specialists as held in the resolution dated 27.7.2016 in the 448th meeting of the Staff Selection Commission. It is thus submitted that the petitioner was rightly not given any weightage for the work done by him as a *Kisan Salahkar*. There is no merit in the instant writ application and the same be dismissed.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the respondents and perused the material on record.

7. The relevant facts in brief is that the petitioner, who was working as a *Kisan Salahkar*, have applied against



advertisement dated 17.2.2016 of the Staff Selection Commission for appointment on the post of Agriculture Coordinator, the petitioner received a letter asking him to come for counseling along with all relevant documents and certificates.

8. As per the petitioner's case, though he produced all the relevant documents /certificates, he was surprised not to find his name in the final list published of the selected candidates.

9. While the petitioner claims that he was wrongly not given weightage for the work done by him, it is the case of the respondents Staff Selection Commission that the weightage was rightly not given to the petitioner in view of the resolution of the Staff Selection Commission referred to herein above

10. As per the Clause 7 of the advertisement, it transpires that weightage upto a maximum 30 marks was to be given for the work experience. As to what work experience would count for giving of weightage upto 30 marks came to be decided in the 448th meeting of the Staff Selection Commission held on 27.7.2016 wherein it was decided that the weightage would be given to the Assistant Technical Manager, Block Technical Manager, Agriculture Coordinator working on contract basis and subject matter specialists.



11. On perusal of the contents of the writ petition and especially Annexure- 3 thereof which is the certificate produced by the petitioner for the work done by him as *Kisan Salahkar*, there remains no doubt that the petitioner had not worked in any of the four capacities which was decided in the meeting held on 27.7.2016 of the Staff Selection Commission of the people who would be entitled for the weightage up to the 30 marks.

12. In view of the above, the Court finds no illegality in the action of the respondents in not giving any weightage for the work done by the petitioner as a *Kisan Salahkar*.

13. The Court finds no merit in the instant writ application and the same is dismissed.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Bibhash

U			
---	--	--	--

