**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**
**W.P (S) No. 3672 of 2025**

Supriya Rana, aged about 30 years, daughter of Jagdeep Rana, resident of Village Khutra, P.O. Pabra, P.S. Katkamsandi, District Hazaribag, Jharkhand ... ... ... ... ... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Chairman, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Ranchi having its office at Jail More, Kurchery, P.O. Kutchery, P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi
3. The Secretary, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Ranchi having its office at Jail More, Kurchery, P.O. Kutchery, P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi
4. The Controller of Examination, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Ranchi having its office at Jail More, Kurchery, P.O. Kutchery, P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi … ... Respondents

**With**

**W.P (S) No. 4477 of 2025**

Vikash Kumar, aged about 27 years, Son of Sohan Gope, resident of Gari Gaon, P.O. Hotwar, P.S. Sadar, District, Ranchi ... … Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Chairman, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Ranchi having its office at Jail More, Kurchery, P.O. Kutchery, P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi
3. The Secretary, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Ranchi having its office at Jail More, Kurchery, P.O. Kutchery, P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi
4. The Controller of Examination, Jharkhand Public Service Commission, Ranchi having its office at Jail More, Kurchery, P.O. Kutchery, P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi … ... Respondents

---

**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

---

For the Petitioners: Dr. (Mrs.) Vandana Singh, Advocate
Mr Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State: Mr Mithilesh Singh, G.A-IV
Mr Yogesh Modi, A.C to A.A.G-IA
For the JPSC: Mr Sanjoy Piprawall, Advocate
Mr Prince Kumar, Advocate
Mr Jay Prakash, Advocate
Mr Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate

---

**Order No. 05/Dated: 23.04.2026**

**1.** Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

**2.** Learned counsel for the parties agree that a common order can dispose of both these petitions.

**3.** At their request and with their consent, we dispose of both these petitions finally, given the order made by a Coordinate Bench on 25.04.2025 in W.P(S) No. 6657 of 2024. The SLP against this order was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 04.08.2025.

**4.** Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue involved in these petitions and in W.P (S) No. 6657 of 2024 are identical and therefore, at least insofar as the Advertisement No. 22/2023 dated 14.08.2023 is concerned, the same relief as was granted to the petitioner in W.P (S) No. 6657 of 2024 should be granted to the petitioners in these petitions.

**5.** In W.P (S) No. 4477 of 2025, the petitioner belongs to the reserved BC-II category and in W.P (S) No. 3672 of 2025, the petitioner belongs to the reserved EBC-I category. This was stated clearly in the application form. However, in the next column, which asked the petitioners whether they were claiming vertical / horizontal reservation, the petitioners replied "No". Based upon this, the petitioners were treated as unreserved category candidates and consequently denied the benefits of reservation.

**6.** In almost identical circumstances, the Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Deepak Kumar versus The State of Jharkhand**

**and others** in **W.P(S) No. 6657 of 2024** granted the relief to the petitioner therein and directed that his candidature should be considered against the reserved category to which he belongs. This order dated 25.04.2025 in W.P(S) No. 6657 of 2024 was followed in **Sangita Kumari and others versus The State of Jharkhand and others** in **W.P (S) No. 2857 of 2025,** disposed of on 24.06.2025. Both these orders were made after hearing the learned counsel for the State and JPSC.

**7.** As against the Coordinate Bench's order dated 25.04.2025 in W.P (C) No. 6657 of 2024, the JPSC preferred Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 20375 of 2025 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. By order dated 04.08.2025, however, this Special Leave Petition was dismissed.

**8.** Therefore, at least insofar as the present Advertisement No. 22/2023 is concerned, the petitioners, in the peculiar facts of the present cases, will have to be granted the limited relief that their candidature should be considered as against the reserved category quota to which they belong and which they had indicated in the application forms. We clarify that this order is made in the peculiar facts of these petitions and the orders of the Coordinate Bench on almost identical facts, one of which was not interfered with by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

**9.** Accordingly, we dispose of both these petitions by directing that the petitioners' candidature should be considered against the reserved category to which they belong and which they have indicated in their application forms.

**10.** Mr Piprawall submits that we should clarify that this order should not be treated as a precedent, insofar as recruitment under any other advertisements is concerned. There is no question of clarification because we have already stated that this order is made in the peculiar facts and circumstances of these petitions, restricted to the Advertisement No. 22/2023 alone, given the orders made by the Coordinate Bench and not interfered with by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

**11.** These petitions are allowed in the aforesaid terms without any order for costs.

**12.** Pending IAs, if any, are also disposed of.

**(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)**

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

**April 23, 2026**
N.A.F.R.
Ranjeet/R.Kr./Cp.2
Uploaded on