

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.717 of 2026

=====

Amar Kumar S/O-Randhir Paswan, Resident of Village- Katesar, P.S.- Bihta,
Distt- Patna- 801103. (Roll no. 214473).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Secretary, Department of Law and Justice, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Registrar General, The High Court of Judicature at Patna, Patna.
3. The Convenor, Centralised Selection and Appointment Committee-Cum-District and Sessions Judge, Patna, Judges Court Road, Civil Court, Patna, P.O.- Bankipore, Distt- Patna- 800004.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nishant Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ranjit Kumar (AC to GP-26)
For the Resp. nos. 2 & 3	:	Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 02-02-2026

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 & 3.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for issuance of an appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions for the following relief/s:-

“I. For a direction upon the respondent authority to set aside the mains examination result published on 03/09/2025 at Annexure-P/6-series i.e. the list of candidates



whose answer booklet cancel due to identification marks found in their answer booklet of the written test held on 18/5/2025 for the post of upper division clerk (Grade-III) and further re-evaluate the copies of mains of these petitioners whose answer booklet has been cancelled due to sort of identification mark found in their answer booklet in view of the contravention of the instruction No-5, as mentioned in the answer booklet, which is completely a mechanical approach for the cancellation of their answer booklet.

II. Further after evaluation of the answer booklet of the petitioners direct the authority concern to prepare a fresh merit list of mains examination and call them for interview in accordance with law.

III. Further also direct the respondent authority as to how the instruction No-05 is applicable to the candidates for the cancellation of their answer booklet where in the instruction column No-5 when itself has not mentioned in detail and it shows some ambiguity simply name or any mark of identification and etc.



IV. Further also direct the concern authority to keep in abeyance the process of interview which is going to be commenced from 08/09/2025 till the disposal of the present writ application as because of the fact when the 15084 candidates answer booklet has been cancelled in the garb of instruction-05.

V. To pass such order/orders, direction/directions command/commands, writ/writs which deem fit and proper in the fact and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not violated any of the terms & conditions as mentioned in the notice dated 03.09.2025, in which, it has been intimated that the answer book of the petitioner has been cancelled. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the alleged wrong is basically no wrong in contravention of instruction no.5 of the booklet, and cancellation of the candidature of this petitioner is completely excessive and arbitrary. Counsel submits that such mistake has been done by 15084 candidates. He submits that it has not been indicated that how and in what manner, instruction no.5 has



been violated. Such decision is ambiguous. He further submits that the respondent authorities may be directed to place the copy of the successful candidates who appeared in the mains examination, as to how and in which manner the said rule has been violated. It has also been requested that the direction for re-evaluation of answer sheet of the booklet in true spirit may be made. Counsel has taken the plea that the petitioner earlier moved before this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 15568 of 2025 (Akanksha Kumari & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.), and *vide* order dated 23.09.2025, this Court has pleased to permit the petitioner to withdraw the same with liberty to file individual writ petitions for redressal of their grievances. The Respondent no.3 was also directed to file a para-wise counter affidavit. Counsel submits that in such circumstances, a direction may be given to the respondent nos. 2 & 3 to file a counter affidavit.

4. After hearing the parties, it transpires to this Court that the decision taken by respondent no.3 is a decision simpliciter. It is not a stigmatic decision. It also transpires that the question which has been annexed indicates that there is something written on the question paper and the decision taken by respondent no.3 is against bulk of candidates who have been alleged to violate instruction no.5.



5. Therefore, this Court is of the firm view that it is a decision simpliciter and not a decision stigmatic. The request of re-evaluation is not permissible under law, particularly, on the grounds mentioned here. In this view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to interfere in this matter. Hence, this writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	04/02/2026
Transmission Date	NA

