

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(S) No. 7739 of 2025

1. Sarita Kumari aged about 43 years Daughter of Balram Ram, resident of village Baralota, P.O. G.L.A. College, P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 2. Anand Kumar, aged about 37 years, son of Balram Ram, resident of village Baralota, P.O. G.L.A. College, P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 3. Md. Khalik aged about 50 years son of Late Abdul Aziz resident of village Kerki, P.O. Panki, P.S. Panki, District Palamau, Jharkhand
 4. Surendra Kumar, aged about 39 years, son of Balram Ram, resident of village Baralota, P.O. G.L.A. College, P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 5. Manesh Oraon aged about 53 years son of Ramlagan Oraon resident of village AhirGurha, P.O. & P.S. Panki, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 6. Ramyad Oraon aged about 37 years son of Visu Oraon resident of village Mahugain, P.O. Panki Kala, P.S. Panki, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 7. Naimuddin Ansari, aged about 47 years, son of Late Rahmatullah Ansari, resident of village Loinga, P.O. Loinga, P.S. Patana, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 8. Kundal Prasad Gupta aged about 44 years son of Late Shiv Saw resident of Village PalheKalan, P.O. PalheKalan, P.S. Patan, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 9. Pawan Kumar aged about 40 years son of Kuldip Ram resident of village Sutha, P.O. Pandeypur, P.S. Patan, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 10. Md. Isaullah Roy, aged about 42, son of Md. Sahabuddin Roy, resident of Sutha village, P.O. Pandeypur, P.S. Patan, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 11. Bikesh Paswan aged about 35 years son of Bachhan Paswan resident of village Barkinemi, P.O. Jhakar, P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 12. Rajesh Kumar aged about 39 years son of Chandradeo Paswan resident of village Belodar, P.O. Purhath Kataiya, P.S. Hariharganj, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
 13. Sanjay Kumar aged about 54 years son of Ramraj Manjhi resident of village Kajri, P.O. Naudiha, P.S. Patan, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
- Petitioner(s)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. The Secretary, Department of Personnel Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, District Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. The Commissioner, Palamau Division, P.O. and P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.

4. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamau P.O. and P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.
5. The Deputy Collector (Establishment), Palamau, P.O. and P.S. Medininagar, District Palamau, Jharkhand.

... .. Respondent(s)

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Dilip Kr. Prasad, Advocate
For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Ravi Kerketta, SC-VI
Ms. Deepika Jojowar, AC to SC-VI
Ms. Rituraj, AC to SC-VI

02/ 07th January, 2026

1. Heard the parties.
2. By filing this writ petition, the petitioners pray for a direction upon the respondents to accept their applications pursuant to an Advertisement No.1/2025 published to appoint persons in Class-IV in the District of Palamau, after giving relaxation in the educational qualification.
3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners earlier applied pursuant to the Advertisement No.1/2010 which was published for the District of Palamau to fill-up the post of Peon i.e., a Class-IV posts. The said advertisement and the process thereafter, were challenged and ultimately the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.(s) 13950-13951 of 2024 had quashed the Advertisement including the consequence arising out of the said advertisement i.e., the appointments. A fresh advertisement was published to fill-up the posts but the petitioners being aggrieved by the minimum educational qualification clause has approached this Court.

The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that now a fresh advertisement has been published wherein the minimum qualification has been prescribed as Matriculation. It is the grievance of the petitioners that the petitioners are non-matriculantes and their qualification is up to Class-8, thus, their educational qualification should be relaxed and they should be allowed to participate in the process of appointment.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the Advertisement was published as per the Rules of appointment in the State of Jharkhand.

Further, he submits that the Advertisement has been published to fill-up the post in P.B-1 i.e., the Scale of 5200-20200 in Grade Pay of 1800 for which as per the Circular of the Finance Department, Matriculation is the minimum qualification.

5. After hearing the parties, I find that in 29th July, 2010, the District of Palamau published an Advertisement to fill-up the Class-IV posts of Peon etc. The said Advertisement was numbered as 01/2010. Pursuant to the said advertisement, the petitioners applied, though they were not selected. The said Advertisement 01/2010 of Palamau District was the subject matter of the Civil Appeal No.(s) 13950-13951 of 2024 as challenge was thrown to the said Advertisement on the ground of illegality/irregularity. The Hon'ble Supreme Court after hearing the parties, set aside the aforesaid Advertisement, as the said Advertisement was in violation of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and other judicial precedents of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further quashed all the appointments made pursuant to the said advertisement and liberty was given to the State to issue fresh advertisement complying with the constitutional mandate and the rules.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the respondents published a fresh advertisement for filling-up of the Class-IV posts, vide Advertisement No.01/2025. The Pay-Scale fixed by the State is P.B-1 (5200-20200) and Grade Pay-1800. The minimum educational qualification has been prescribed in Paragraph 8 of the said Advertisement which is Matriculation. The same was in terms of the Resolution of the Finance Department, being Resolution No.1859 dated 02.09.2011. The petitioners are aggrieved by the aforesaid clause. The petitioners want that the said educational qualification clause is to be relaxed as the petitioners are non-matriculate and they should also be given a chance to apply.

7. The respondents have brought to the notice of this

Court, a Resolution No.1859 dated 02.09.2011, in which, as per Clause-5 (क) for Pay-Scale of 5200-20200 with Grade Pay of 1800, the minimum education qualification prescribed is Matriculate.

8. In this case, the Pay-Scale which is being fixed by the State for the Class-IV employees is 5200-20200 in Grade Pay-1800, thus the advertisement prescribed the minimum education qualification to be Matriculation which is in term of the Resolution No.1859 dated 02.09.2011.

9. Since the Pay-Scale prescribed by the State in the Advertisement is 5200-20200 with Grade Pay of 1800, they are correct in fixing the educational qualification as Matriculation, for the proposed employee who are applying pursuant to the said advertisement. I find no illegality in action of the respondents whereby they have fixed the minimum education qualification to be Matriculate. Thus, no relief can be granted to the petitioners. Accordingly, this writ petition stands **dismissed**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

07.01.2026
S.K.D., cp2

Uploaded on 12.01.2026