

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7843 of 2026

Pratima Kumari D/o Janak Ram, Resident of Village - Dumari Chhapiya, P.O.
- Dumari Chhapiya, P.S. - Taraiya, District- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Principal Secretary General Administrative Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary General Administrative Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat, Patna through its Secretary.
4. The Secretary, The Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat, Patna.
5. The Selection Committee of Advertisement no. 01/2023 Of the Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajiv Kumar Ram, Advocate
	:	Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Advocate
	:	Mr. Santosh Bharti, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. U.S.S. Singh, GP-19
For the Res Nos. 3 to 5	:	Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh, Sr. Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 16-06-2026

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs:-

- I. To issue writ of Mandamus directing and commanding the respondent authorities to withdraw the Result dated 05.09.2025 by which they declared the result of Security Guard under the Bihar Legislative Secretariat Advertisement no. 01/2023.*
- II. To issue writ of prohibition directing and commanding the respondent authorities especially respondent no. 5 to withdraw the*



Result dated 05.09.2025 by which he declared the result of Security Guard under the Bihar Legislative Secretariat Advertisement no. 01/2023 and declare the fresh result after due consideration on the performance of the petitioner in the physical test after perusing the videography of the same.”

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an advertisement was issued by the Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat, Patna vide Advertisement No. 01 of 2023 for appointment of Security Guards. The petitioner being eligible submitted her application and after going through the selection procedure, finally she appeared in the physical test. He submits that despite the petitioner being number one in her slot in the physical test, she has not been declared successful.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has obtained the time of four minute forty seconds, however she has only been awarded 60 marks in the physical test, although she was expecting 100 marks for the same. He submits that despite her request to provide her video recording of the said physical test, she has been denied the same and to her utter surprise, she has been denied the appointment, despite being the number one in her slot in completing the race. He submits that the action of the respondent authorities is not in accordance with law,



since it was incumbent upon them to provide the videography to the petitioner or to check the same in presence of the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner filed an application under the Right to Information Act, however the correct information was not provided to the petitioner. Thereafter, she preferred an appeal before the appellant authority. The appellant authority also gave similar answer to what was provided to her under the Right to Information Act. He submits that the case of the petitioner deserves consideration, since she is a scheduled caste lady and in spite of her giving her best performance, she failed to get satisfactory result.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat submits that selection process has already culminated in appointment of 69 selected candidates. The petitioner has not impleaded even a single successful candidate as a party respondent to the present petition and has challenged the result published by the Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat on 05.09.2025. He submits that the writ petition is fit to be dismissed on the ground of non-joinder of parties, since it was incumbent upon the petitioner to implead the selected candidates or at least the last selected candidate, as a party respondent in the present writ petition.



6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the records, it appears that the petitioner has prayed for withdrawal of the entire result dated 05.09.2025, issued by the Bihar Legislative Assembly Secretariat, for selection of Security Guard, in terms of Advertisement No. 01 of 2023, however not a single selected candidate has been impleaded as a party respondent in the present writ petition, which is required to be done.

7. Considering the above, the writ petition stands dismissed on the ground of non-joinder of parties.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

ajay/raushan/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16.06.2026
Transmission Date	NA

