IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P(S). No. 3874 of 2019

Giridhar Gopal Pandit, aged about 43 years, Son of Kartik Pandit, Resident of 83, Gram-Patharadda, P.O-Patharadd, P.S Sarath, District-Deoghar

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand, office at Project Building, P.O+P.S-Dhurwa, District Ranchi, Jharkhand
2. The Jharkhand Staff Selection Commission, through the Secretary, Office at Chai Bagan, Kali Naga, P.O and P.S Namkom, District Ranchi, Jharkhand
3. The Secretary, Jharkhand Staff Selection Commission, Ranchi, office at Chai Bagan, Kali Nagar, P.O and P.S Namkom, District Ranchi, Jharkhand

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anand Kr. Sinha, Advocate
For the Resp. (J.S.S.C.) : Mr. Sanjay Piprawall, Advocate
: Mr. Prince Kumar, Advocate
: Mr. Jay Prakash, Advocate
: Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate

10/ Dated: 29.04.2026

1. Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

2. The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioner praying therein for quashing and setting aside the order (Annexure-VII), whereby the candidature of the petitioner has been cancelled by JSSC on the ground that the petitioner has no educational qualification as required under section-4 ('ख') of the notice issued by Jharkhand State Selection Commission for Combined Graduate Trained Teacher Examination, 2016.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that on the one hand, the respondents have denied the candidature of the petitioner and on the other hand, which is evident from the supplementary affidavit that other similarly

situated persons who were not having the main subject as Hindi, have been selected.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submit that this appointment arises out of advertisement of 2016 and the entire examination process is over and the candidates have been selected in the year 2022 itself. Now in the year 2026, a right has already been created by the selected candidates.

5. From the order-sheet, it does not transpire that any of the seat has been reserved for the petitioner. Moreover, the co-ordinate bench of this Court in the similar matter; exactly on the similar facts for the same advertisement i.e. in that case in the case of ***Vipasha Pandey v. The State of Jharkhand & Ors.[WP(S) No. 1897 of 2019]*** did not interfere with the order. The case of the petitioner was same and similar in as much as she was not appointed because her main subject was not Hindi; rather she studied Hindi as a subsidiary subject only and the co-ordinate bench did not interfere with the order.

6. I am also of the same view that if any person who wants to be a teacher of any particular subject; then that subject should be the main subject of that candidate and then only one can provide better education.

7. Even otherwise, the last selected candidate has not been made party in the instant application and as stated herein above, the entire process of appointment was over by the year 2022, as such no relief can be granted to the petitioner, even on the ground of parity.

8. Accordingly, this writ application stands dismissed.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

Abha/-

Dated: 29.04.2026