
(2000) 05 PAT CK 0008
In the Patna High Court
Case No : C.W.J.C. No. 7880 of 1998

Dr. Rajesh Narayan

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Bihar and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 09-05-2000

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2000) 4 PLJR 415

Hon'ble Judges : S.J. Mukhopadhaya, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Ashwini Kumar Singh, for the Appellant; Sheojee Prasad for the I.G.I.M.S., M/s Keshav Shrivastava and Amit Pawan for Respondent Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9 and Mr. Rajiv Nandan Prasad for the State, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

S.J. Mukhopadhaya, J.—The petitioner has challenged the selection for appointment as made in favour of Respondents 6 to 9 as Senior Residents, Department of General Surgery and Reproductive Biology, Urology and G.I. Surgery under Indira Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences Sheikhpura, Patna (I.G.I.M.S. for short). The sole question raised that the selection, in question and appointment have been made solely on the basis of interview, without resorting to any other test, like written tests.

2. It appears that in pursuance of a notice dated 27th June, 1998 published in the local daily "THE TIMES OF INDIA" the petitioner and others applied for appointment as Senior Resident in different Departments, as stated above. Three separate interview letters were issued for appointment of petitioner in respect of three Departments on 8th August, 1998 The interview held on 18th August, 1998 between 10.30 A.M. to 1.30 P.M. and second from 2.30 P.M. to 4.30 P.M., (sic) which the contesting Respondents also appeared. After such interview, the contesting Respondents were selected and appointed but no appointment order having issued in favour of the petitioner this application has been preferred.

3. The counsel for the petitioner mainly stressed on the time as allowed to favour of one or other candidates during the interview to suggest that the total five minutes" time was allotted to one candidate to make selection. The panel/merit list having prepared on the basis of marks obtained in the interview. Reliance was also placed on the decisions of the

Supreme Court in the case of Ajay Hasia and Others Vs. Khalid Mujib Sehravardi and Others, and Miss Arti Sapru and Others Vs. State of Jammu & Kashmir and Others, .

4. It was submitted that viva-voce examination though permissible as a test for selection, allocation of higher marks in interview is arbitrary and unreasonable.

According to the counsel for the petitioner, the interview was formal as intellect and aptitude of a candidate could not have been assessed within five minutes, along with the verification of records/certificates.

5. The aforesaid submission was controverted by the counsel for the Respondents. According to the Respondents, actually one candidate was interviewed for one or more posts. For example, the petitioner applied for three posts, where merit was assessed during an interview. It was pointed out that for consideration of appointment against three posts of same rank but of different Departments, once documents verified, it was applicable for assessment of merit for all three posts and three times verification were not made, as suggested on behalf of the petitioner. It was further submitted that the petitioner having applied with open eye that the selection was to be made on the basis of interview, he cannot raise the aforesaid question having not selected. It was pointed out that no stipulation of other test was mentioned in the advertisement and the petitioner never challenged the same.

The counsel also relied on the Supreme Court's decisions in Secy. (Health) Deptt. of Health and F.W. and Another Vs. Dr. Anita Puri and Others, , Siya Ram Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Others, , and Lila Dhar Vs. State of Rajasthan and Others, .

In the case of Siaram (supra), the Supreme Court held that the provision for marks in interview test need not and cannot be the same for admission to college and entry into the public service. In the case of service to which recruitment had necessarily to be made from persons of matured personality, interview test may be the only way, subject to basic and essential academic and professional requirements. Subjecting such persons to written test might yield unfruitful and negative results. Thus appointment cannot be held to be illegal solely on the ground that the selection was made on the basis of interview.

6. It is not in dispute that the post of Senior Residents are specialised for which specialised qualification required as was laid down in the advertisement. In the matter of such selection of professional persons who will deal with the patients, if the selection is made by experts on the basis of interview, I find no illegality in

the same.

This apart, the order of appointment, of contesting Respondents having not enclosed, nor challenged, I find no reason to interfere with such appointments, which have been made for tenure of three years. I find no merit in the case. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.