

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.65 of 2025

1. Fulendra Yadav son of Maheshwari Yadav Resident of village- Basua, P.O.- Basbitti, ward no.12, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
2. Vidyanand Ram son of Nandelal Ram resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
3. Santosh Kumar son of Anandi Ram resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
4. Ashok Ram son of Anandi Ram resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
5. Umesh Ram son of Bhumi Ram resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
6. Manish Raj son of Satya Narayan Sharma resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
7. Alok Kumar Mandal son of Ram Prasad Mandal resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.10, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
8. Jagdev Sada son of Rasiklal Sada resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
9. Gunnanand Ram son of Anandai Ram resident of village- Bhurahi, ward no.11, P.O.- Basbitti, P.S.- Supaul, District- Supaul-852130.
10. Binod Kumar Yadav son of Kalanand Yadav resident of Basabitti, Mushahriniya, Ward no.-01, District- Supaul- 852130.

... .. 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, Sardar Patel Bhawan, Baily road, Patna, 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, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mujtabaul Haque, GP-12

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER



6 10-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State

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

*“For issuance of a writ in the
nature of "Mandamus" whereby and
whereunder commanding and directing the
state respondents hereinabove to consider
the case of the aforesaid petitioners for the
post of Home Guards in relation to
advertisement no. 01/2006/02/2011 for
which the petitioners hereinabove had
applied for empanelment as home guards in
the District of Supaul but their cases have
not been considered by the state
respondents.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the
petitioners appeared for Advertisement No. 01/2006, which was
subsequently amalgamated into Advertisement No. 02/2011.
Counsel further submits that the petitioners participated in the
selection process, including the physical test, and were
successful. However, despite their success, they were not
considered. The final result was published in 2019. As the
petitioners were not considered, they have filed the present writ
petition before this Hon’ble Court.



4. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that a counter affidavit has been filed and contends that the claim of the petitioners is absolutely perverse, as it is the specific stand of the State that none of the petitioners were found qualified in the physical test conducted for the post of Home Guard. In this regard, the State has annexed a copy of the master chart as Annexure R/1.

5. Upon perusal of the record, it transpires to this Court that the counsel for the petitioners has not filed any rejoinder to the reply made in the counter affidavit.

6. In view of the submissions made above, particularly the specific stand of the State that none of the petitioners have completed the physical test, as supported by the master chart, and also considering that no rejoinder has been filed by the petitioners, this Court has no option but to accept the pleadings of the State.

7. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

