

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5096 of 2016

=====

Rajeev Kumar Paswan Son of Upendra Paswan, Resident of Village -
Raghunathpur, P.S. - Bhargama, District - Araria.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Home Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Araria.
3. The Sub - Divisional Officer, Forbisganj, District - Araria.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Araria.
5. The Police Inspector, Raniganj Police Station, District - Araria.
6. The Officer - in - Charge, P.S. - Bhargama, District - Araria.
7. Laxman Tatma, Son of Late Badri Tatma, Resident of Village - Raghunathpur South, P.S. - Bhargama, District - Araria, Presently Chaukidar of Raghunathpur Village, under P.S. Bhargama District - Araria.
8. The Sub-divisional Officer, Forbisganj, Araria

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Pravina Kumari, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Martuth Nath Roy, AC to SC-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-03-2018

Leave is granted to the learned counsel for the petitioner to
correct the status of respondent no.3 during the course of the day.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

It is the grievance of the petitioner that the private
respondent, who was appointed as Chaukidar under Bhargama Police
Station in the district of Araria, has been misusing his position to
cause atrocities on the common public. It is also the grievance that the
said private respondent was involved in a criminal case arising from
G.R.No. 661/1986 registered for offences punishable under sections
354, 323 and 379 of the Indian Penal Code and which has resulted in
conviction and in which he has undergone imprisonment. It is stated



that suppressing all these facts that the private respondent has obtained appointment of a Chaukidar vide order bearing Memo No. 1187 dated 14.4.1988 of the Sub-divisional Officer, Araria. It is also the grievance of the petitioner that the criminal activity of the private respondent has not stopped and he is yet indulging in illegal act to threaten the common public.

Although some kind of representation has been filed by the petitioner and the villagers before the District Magistrate, Araria but since the same has not been given consideration hence, this writ petition.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of grievance raised, this Court would direct the Sub-divisional Officer, Araria to consider the grievance so raised in the writ petition as also noted above and dispose of the same in accordance with law after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and the private respondent within a period of three months of the date of receipt/ production of a copy of this order.

With the aforementioned observation and direction, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Surendra/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	09.03.2018
Transmission Date	NA



