

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1694 of 2015
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.707 of 1998

=====

Ranjeet Kumar S/o Sri Raktu Prasad Singh @ Raghu Singh resident of
Karpuri Market, Town and District - Lakhisarai

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Ministry of Home, South Block, New Delhi
2. The Director General, Boarder Security Force C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi
3. Mr. Om Prakash, Deputy Commandant, 60 Battalion, Boarder Security Force,
Kishanganj, Bihar
4. Mr. V.K. Giri, Assistant Commandant, 60 Battalion, Boarder Security Force,
Kishanganj, Bihar
5. The Commandant, 60 Battalion, Boarder Security Force, Kishanganj, Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Pranav Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondents	:	Mr. S.D Sanjay (Addl. Soc. Gen.)
		Mr. Anshay Bahadur Mathur, C.G.C.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

Date : 31-08-2017

Heard counsel for the appellant, learned Additional Solicitor
General for the Union of India. Perused the order dated 06.04.2015
passed by the learned single Judge in C.W.J.C. No. 707 of 1998.

After due regular enquiry, which was held and conducted
against the appellant for his acts of omission and commission
which has been dealt with in paragraph 4 of the impugned order,



the charges brought against the appellant was established in the enquiry. The process and procedure which was adopted for conduct of the enquiry as well as the relevant rules and provisions have also been dealt with in a wider detail by the learned single Judge and then he came to a conclusion that the materials being what they are and the evidence, the order of punishment was not interfered with.

Many a things had been said and submitted, which is being repeated even before this Court in appeal. The main contention which has been urged at the bar has been duly dealt with in paragraph 20 and 21 of the impugned order and the learned single Judge came to a considered opinion that there are no infirmities which could compel him to interfere in the proceeding or the sentence passed upon the petitioner/appellant where interference was required.

Mere repetition of the provisions and the rules does not make the things any better than what it was while it was being dealt with by the learned single Judge. The submissions are more made than made out.

In view of the same, the Court is not convinced that any error has been committed by the learned single Judge which requires to be rectified in appeal.



Appeal has no merit. It is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	01.09.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

