

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 307 of 2024

Gitanjali Verma, daughter of Dilip Verma, resident of Opposite Galaxiya Mall, Kali Mandir Road, Sukhdeo Nagar, Ratu Road, P.O Hehal, P.S.- Sukhdeonagar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand. .. Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Jharkhand, Office at Project Building, Dhurwa, Ranchi.
2. The Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Govt. of Jharkhand, Office at Project Building, Dhurwa, Ranchi.
3. The Director, Directorate of Secondary Education, Department of School Education and Literacy, Govt. of Jharkhand, Office at Project Building, Dhurwa, Ranchi.
4. Jharkhand Staff Selection Commission, through its Secretary, Office at Chaibagan Gali, Kali Nagar, P.O and P.S- Namkum, District- Ranchi.
5. The Controller of Examination, Jharkhand Staff Selection Commission, having its office at Chaibagan Gali, Kali Nagar, P.O and P.S- Namkum, District- Ranchi. ...Respondent(s)

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the petitioner(s):	Mr. Amritansh Vats, Advocate.
For the State	Mr. Omiya Anusha, AC to AAG-IA
For JSSC	M/s Sanjoy Piprawall, Princie Kumar, Jay Prakash, Rakesh Ranjan and Rakesh Kumar-III, Advocates.

05/29.01.2026: Heard the parties.

2. By filing this petition, the petitioner has challenged the cancellation of the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT) for subject- Economics, pursuant to Advertisement, which was published in the year 2016.
3. From the arguments advanced by the parties, I find that the petitioner had applied for the post of Trained Graduate Teacher for subject- Economics, pursuant to Advertisement of 2016. After the results were published, the candidature of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that the petitioner had not completed the B.Ed. course, she was ineligible to participate in the selection process thus cannot be appointed.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that in respect of several other subjects, the respondents have taken a decision that the candidates who completes the required education, prior to publication of the results, will be considered for appointment. In this case, the petitioner has now completed her B.Ed. course and such completion being prior to publication of the results, the candidature of the petitioner be considered and she be selected for appointment. He further submits that as per the marks-sheet, the final result of the B.Ed course of the petitioner was published on 30th November, 2018, thus the petitioner qualifies for the appointment.

5. Learned counsel for the Jharkhand Staff Selection Commission submits that as per the Rules of appointment and Advertisement of 2016, the petitioner was ineligible candidate and could not have filled up the form in terms of Clause 4(v) of the advertisement read with Rule 9(ii) of the Recruitment Rules, as the petitioner had not completed her B.Ed. course on the date of the application or on the date of examination, which was conducted for the said appointment.

6. As stated earlier, the advertisement to fill up the post of Trained Graduate Teacher was published in the year 2016. The Appointment Rules specially Rule 9(ii) provides that if a candidate has completed the course of B.Ed and is awaiting for final examination, he/she can appear pursuant to the aforesaid advertisement.

7. The said provision of the Rule has been followed in the Advertisement in Clause 4(v), wherein, it has been mandated that a candidate, who has completed the course of training i.e. B.Ed and is waiting to appear in the Examination on completion of the said course, they will be eligible to appear in the Examination.

8. In this case, admittedly, the session of the B.Ed. course of the petitioner was 2016-2018. This means the petitioner will complete her course in the year 2018 and not before that. Only thereafter examination can be held. The petitioner has applied for appointment in the year 2017 itself, as the last date for filling up the form for the said appointment was 25.4.2017. This means that without completing the B.Ed. course, the petitioner applied for the said post. Completion of B.Ed course is *sine qua non* for filling up the application form for the said post. This is a mandatory provision, which cannot be relaxed. Rules also provides for the same.

9. Since the petitioner, without completing the B.Ed. course, had applied for her appointment, pursuant to advertisement of 2016, she naturally becomes ineligible. The respondents have thus correctly rejected the candidature of the petitioner.

10. In view of the aforesaid facts, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. Accordingly, this writ petition is **dismissed**.

11. Pending interlocutory application, if any, also stands disposed of.