

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.681 of 2025

=====

Jyoti Rani D/o Late Kharag Bahadur Singh, Resident of Mohalla- Krishi
Vibhag Colony, Ward No-37, Officer Colony Road, P.S.- Bettiah Town, Dist-
West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Inspector General of Police (Welfare), Bihar, Patna.
5. The Deputy Inspector General of Police (Personnel), Bihar, Patna.
6. The Deputy Inspector General of Police (Human Right), Bihar, Patna.
7. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Champaran Range, Bettiah, West
Champaran.
8. The Superintendent of Police, Bettiah, West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Md. Harun Quareshi, AC to SC-01

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 22-06-2026

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and

learned Counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed with

the following reliefs:-

*“a. For issuance of a writ in the
nature of mandamus or any other
appropriate writ, order/s, directions
commanding the respondents to pass a
reasoned and speaking order over the
representations on the petitioner
continuously given before the*



respondents in the light of the order dated 12.09.2003 passed by this Hon'ble court in C.W.J.C. No. 3839/2003.

b. For any other relief/s to which the petitioner is found entitled to."

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing CWJC No. 3839 of 2003, wherein, vide order dated 12.09.2003, this Court granted liberty to the petitioner to submit a representation regarding her grievance on the strength of Rule 663(a)(iii) of the Police Manual. This Court further observed that if it was found that no consensus decision had been taken by the Selection Committee with respect to the candidates belonging to the Gorkha Community, the petitioner's case might be reconsidered. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition was disposed of.

4. Learned Counsel further submits that, thereafter, the petitioner continuously submitted representations from time to time; however, no favourable decision was taken thereon. It is fairly conceded that the petitioner did not initiate contempt proceedings for enforcement of the aforesaid order. It is further submitted that, since no decision was taken on her



repeated representations, the petitioner ultimately filed the present writ petition in the year 2024, which has been registered as CWJC No. 681 of 2025.

5. Learned Counsel for the State submits that a counter affidavit has been filed wherein it has been stated that the petitioner's representation was duly considered and decided in the year 2023. It has been stated that the petitioner was appointed as a Constable pursuant to Memo No. 433/1998 dated 03.04.1998. Subsequently, vide District Order No.20 she was removed from service with effect from 07.01.2003. It is further stated that the petitioner challenged the aforesaid order by filing CWJC No. 3839 of 2003, wherein this Court granted liberty to the petitioner to file a representation. Thereafter, the petitioner filed representation. The operative portion of the said order reads as follows:-

“..... I would permit the petitioner to make representation in respect of her grievance on the strength of Rule 663(a) (iii) of the Police Manual. Accordingly, if it is found that no conscious decision otherwise was taken by the Selection Committee with respect to the candidates of Gurkhas Community, her case be reconsidered.”

6. This Court also feels it pertinent to quote Rule 663(a) of the Bihar Police Manual as under :-



“663(a) Strong, healthy young men between the ages of 19 and 27 years and who have passed secondary (i.e. Matriculation) examination shall be selected as recruits as far as possible. The standard of physical tests shall be same as given in Appendix 38, clause 9 for Sub-Inspectors. For scheduled cases and tribes, the upper age-limit is up to 32 years and educational qualification can be reduced to middle pass if matriculates are not available. The standards of height and chest measurements are given below. There are the minima and Superintendents should endeavour to get men of higher standard:-

(iii) There is no physical standard for Gurkhas, who are residents of India and men of the best physique obtainable and at least literate shall be enlisted.”

7. Upon perusal of the relevant provision, namely Rule 663(a) of the Bihar Police Manual, it transpires to this Court that the prescribed age limit for appointment is 19 to 27 years, while the upper age limit for candidates belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is 32 years. From the pleadings on record, it further transpires that the petitioner was 40 years of age at the relevant point of time.

8. In view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that Rule 663(a)(iii) of the Bihar Police Manual does not advance the petitioner's case or entitle her to



any relief at this stage.

9. Accordingly, finding no merit in the writ petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/Manshi

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	23/06/2026
Transmission Date	NA

