P H. (Scn. III - 5) Office notes as to action Serial ORDER WITH SIGNATURE Date of Order No of (if any) taken on order. Order IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA C.W.J.C. No. 2904 of 1999 Smt. Prabha Kumari Vs. State of Bihar & ors. For the petitioner: Mr. D.K. Sinha, Sr. Advocate For the State : Mr. A.K. Singh, S.C. 3 For the B.P.S.C. : Mr. Nee u Agrawa, Advocate Heard counsel for the parties. 8.7.2004 39. Hona petitioner has prayed for issuance of a direction upon the respondents Bihar Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to the Commission) to publish her result for the It appreams that the pentils Geologist. post of Assistant the Commission. the examinations held by However, her result was not published nor name was recommended to the government for appointment to the post of Assistant Geologist. petitioner for the Learned counsel petitioner belongs to submitted that the backward (lady) category and she had submitted her application along with certificates granted authority claiming by the appropriate 27/216 backward (lady) category reservation against submitted that is further It post. petitioner was a successful candidate in the written examination and accordingly interview issued to her and she appeared for interview but some how or the other, her result was not published.

Office notes as to action Serial ORDER WITH SIGNATURE Date of Order No. of (if any) taken on order. Order

affidavit and also counter supplementary counter affidavit have been filed on behalf of the Commission stating therein that a successful petitioner was hot since the her result was not published. candidate. court vide order dated 24.6.2004 directed learned counsel for the Commission to produce the relevant chart showing marks obtained by successful and unsuccessful candidates pursuant to which a supplementary counter affidavit has been filed and relevant documents have appended showing that the petitioner had claimed herself to be a candidate of 05 (+05) category but her claim was considered as a candidate of of category in absence of certificate issued by the District Magistrate. The cut off marks for 01 category candidate was 40% where for category the percentage was 36.5% and for the (lady) category cardidate percentage S.C./S.T. was 32% whereas the petitioner, in all, secured Agrawal, learned 22.5% marks. Mrs. Neelu counsel appearing on behalf of the Commission, therefore, submitted that the petitioner cannot be treated in either of the dategories as by her is much below the percentage secured percentage prescribed for 05 category.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this juncture, tried to impress upon the court that in case the petitioner had secured

| PH.C. | Sch. III - 5) | | Office notes as to action |
|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Serial No. of Order | Date of Order | ORDER WITH SIGNATURE | (if any) taken on order. |
| | | insufficient marks in | the written test, |
| | | interview letter could no | have been results |
| | her and since interview letter was given to her, she has legitimate expectation that she has secured sufficient marks. | | tter was given to her, |
| | | | ation that she has |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| marks obtained | | The question as | to the exactness of the |
| | | marks obtained by the pe | titioner cannot be gone |
| | into in this writ application at the face of the documents placed on record by the Commission. | | tion at the face of the |
| | | | ord by the Commission. |
| Prima facie, it appears from the materi record that the petitioner secured 22.5% which was not the qualifying marks for e | | from the materials on | |
| | | ner secured 22.5% marks | |
| | | ying marks for either of | |
| | | the categories. | |
| | | | easons aforementioned, |
| | | | nd sufficient reason to |
| | | | 18 |
| | | interfere in the matte | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| , * | | accordingly dismissed. | |
| | | | |
| | Anil | Ma (Na | enger Roy |
| e)i | | | |
| | | ME Tolon | |
| | | | |
| 11. 51 | | | |
| | | | |

-