

(2012) 09 PAT CK 0099

In the Patna High Court

Case No : Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13980 of 2012

Jawed Alam

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Bihar

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 20-09-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2013) 2 BBCJ 339

Hon'ble Judges : Mr. Navin Sinha, J.

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : In CWJC No.13980 of 2012; Mr. Ansul, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gp8, for the Respondent; In CWJC No.10191 of 2012; Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Mr. P.K. Verma Aag5, for the Respondent; In CWJC No.14047 of 2012; Mr. Shankar Kumar, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Mr. Sanjay Kr No.2 Ga5, for the Respondent; In CWJC No.14086 of 2012; Mr. Shankar Kumar, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Mr. Neelu Agrwal Ga6, for the Respondent; In CWJC No.14122 of 2012; Mr. Shankar Kumar, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Mr. Shyam Kishor Sharma Ga3, for the Respondent; In CWJC No.17497 of 2012; Mr. Alok Kumar Singh, Advocate, for the Petitioner; Mr. Devendra Kr Sinha Aag2, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

Mr. Navin Sinha, J. (Oral)—Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioners and the State in this batch of writ applications.

2. The common question involved in this batch of writ applications is if the Shiksha Shastri degree stated to be equivalent to B. Ed, of the petitioners, from Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishwavidlaya is valid or is the Institution unrecognised.

3. The respondents were directed to produce the original records as the Court wanted to satisfy itself if the respondents had applied their mind to all aspects before taking any such decision. The original record reveals that the decision of the respondents is based on certain information down loaded from the Internet coupled with a news item, a hearsay evidence. The petitioners have also down

loaded materials from the Internet to the contrary.

4. This Court in CWJC No. 13777 of 2012 has already held that information obtained from the Internet may be a good source of knowledge and information to start a debate but cannot be conclusive by itself relying upon observations of the Supreme Court in (2011) 4 SCC 85 (T. V. Venugopal v. Ushodaya Enterprises Limited).

5. At this stage learned Additional Advocate General No. 2 submits that the State may be permitted to examine all aspects of the matter, collect necessary information, and then take a decision in accordance with law.

6. The Court expects the State to take an expeditious decision in the matter preferably within a maximum period of three ? four months from the date of receipt and/or presentation of a copy of this order and act fairly and reasonably in so far as the petitioners be concerned dependant on the final decision that the State may take in the matter.

7. Needless to state that if the State acted on the basis of Internet information, the petitioners have done no better. Should they desire to furnish additional materials in support of their claims the State is required to consider the same appropriately provided it is furnished to the state authorities within reasonable time so as not to hinder a final decision within four months.

8. The writ applications are disposed.