
(2025) 06 JH CK 0865
In the Jharkhand High Court
Case No : W.P.(S) No. 1876 Of 2025

Diwakar Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jharkhand through the Chief Secretary

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 11-06-2025

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2025) 06 JH CK 0865

Hon'ble Judges : Deepak Roshan, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Yash Harsh Vardhan, Sudhanshu Kr. Singh, Tejo Mistry

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Deepak Roshan, J

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioner for the following reliefs:-
 - (i) For the issuance of an appropriate writ/writs in the nature of mandamus for ensuring that the Petitioner who was duly shortlisted after qualifying the Combined Graduate Trained Teacher Competitive Exam 2016 is able to get his documents verified and be appointed for the necessary post.
 - (ii) For issuance of writ in nature of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint the Petitioner after necessary document verification commensurate post.
3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has duly qualified the Combined Graduate Trained Teacher Competitive Exam 2016 by securing 125 marks in Paper-I and 160 marks in Paper-II and the Respondents never informed the Petitioner by any speed post/e-mail/text message/phone call or by giving a public advertisement in any of the national dailies which could ensure the Petitioner being aware of such a development and make timely

arrangements to ensure his fair participation in the document verification process and he only came to know about him being shortlisted for the selection process through one of his acquaintances.

He further submits that on account of his disappointment, the Petitioner gave his representation to the Chairman JSSC and to the other functionaries and authorities on 30.09.2024 and 14.10.2024 but no response has yet been received; as such he prays for the aforesaid relief.

4. Learned Counsel for the Respondents submits that this issue with regards to informing the candidate by any speed post/e-mail/text message/phone call or by giving a public advertisement in any of the national dailies has already been decided in L.P.A. No. 143 of 2024, as such no relief should be granted to the petitioner.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties it transpires that this issue has already been decided in L.P.A. No. 143 of 2024 wherein the Division Bench of this court has held in para 35 -37 which are quoted herein below:

"35. Admittedly, Clause 16(4)(π)(viii) of the advertisement specifically provided for furnishing of information regarding the examination only through the website of the Commission. The appellants were fully aware of the same and they are also bound by the same. They cannot seek any relaxation of the terms and conditions of the advertisement and cannot find fault with the Commission for adhering to the said norms. When opportunity for document verification was given at least three times to each of the appellants as pointed out by the learned Single Judge, and it was not availed by them because of their own negligence in not checking the website of the Commission from time to time, they are not entitled to any relief on the basis of sympathy.

36. Merely because some of the other successful candidates were informed about the dates of document verification through an advertisement or otherwise through email, parity cannot be sought as rightly held by the learned Single Judge. Only a person who has enforceable right can claim parity with similarly situated persons but not otherwise.

37. We therefore, do not find any merit in the Letters Patent Appeals and they are accordingly dismissed."

6. In view of the aforesaid judgement rendered in L.P.A. No.143 of 2024; the contention of the Petitioner does not have any stand in the eye of law, inasmuch as, Clause 16(4)(π) (viii) of the advertisement specifically provided for furnishing of information regarding the examination only through the website of the Commission and thus the Petitioner cannot seek any relaxation of the terms and conditions of the advertisement and cannot find fault with the Commission for adhering to the said norms.

7. Accordingly, this Writ application is dismissed. Pending I.A., if any, stands

closed.