

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8191 of 2014

- =====
1. Rishi Jaiswal son of Sri Raj Kumar Jaiswal, Resident of Chhoti Patan Devi, P.S. Chowk, Patna City, District Patna
 2. Rajiv Kumar Srivastva son of Sri Jainti Nandan, Resident of House No. 16, Indrapuri, Road No. 6, P.S. Patliputra Colony, District- Patna
- Petitioners

Versus

1. The Union of India through Ministry of Finance, Department of Financial Services, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi through its Joint Secretary (BA and PI)
 2. The Institute of Banking Personal Selection (IBPS), IBPS House, 90 feet D.P. Road, Near Thakur Polytechnic, Off Western Highway, P.B. No. 8587, Kandivali (E), Mumbai- 400101 through its Director
 3. The National Institute of Bank Management, NIBM, Post Office Kondhwe Khurd, Pune- 411048 through its Director
- Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. S.Kr.Verma & B.B.Sinha, Advocates
For the Respondent UOI : Mr. N. A. Shamsi
For respondent 2 & 3 : Mr.Siddhartha Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 11-12-2014 Petitioners seek direction to the respondents to consider their case for subsequent process of provisional allotment for the post of Provisionary officer in one of the nationalized banks.

Pursuant to the advertisement dated 10.7.2013 contained in Annexure 1 petitioners applied for the post of the Probationary officer in the public sector bank. It is the case of the petitioners that they scored more than the cut off marks in the written examination. Petitioner no.1 belongs to OBC, whereas petitioner no.2 belongs to Scheduled Caste and they

secured 35.60% and 41.40% marks respectively. Petitioners state that they got qualified even in the interview, then they were entitled for subsequent/provisional allotment process in spite of a number of existing vacancies. Petitioners have further referred to order dated 31.3.2014, passed by this Court in C.W.J.C.No. 4288 of 2014.

Counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent no.2 stating that it is not the case of petitioners that any one having lesser marks than the petitioners have been appointed.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of with direction to respondent no.2 with observation that if the petitioners file fresh representation raising the issues made in the writ petition, the same would be disposed of by speaking order within two months thereof.

Shashi.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J)

U			
---	--	--	--