

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 12544 of 2014

=====

Parsuram Paswan Son of Bundela Paswan Resident of Village- Lohar, Post Office- Muspur, P.S.- Noorsarai, District- Nalanda. At present residing in State Quarter, Block Colony, Noorsarai, District- Nalanda.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Nalanda (Bihar Sharif)
3. The Deputy Collector Establishment Nalanda (Bihar Sharif)
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Nalanda (Bihar Sharif)
5. The Circle Officer, Noorsarai Block Nalanda (Bihar Sharif)
6. Rajendra Prasad Verma Retired Nazir Noorsarai Anchal District Nalanda.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Rajendra Nath Sinha, Advocate
For the S t a t e : Mr Rajesh Kumar, AC to GP III

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-01-2018

Heard counsel for the petitioner and the respondents.

2 It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has been visited with the order of punishment on the basis of his confessional statement. It is further submitted that the same was obtained fraudulently by the *Nazir* who is primarily responsible for the missing of the revenue receipts. Challenge has also been made to the appellate order dated 05.04.2014 passed in Service Appeal No 569 of 2012 by the Court of Divisional Commissioner, Patna. The petitioner has also sought quashing of his dismissal order issued by respondent No 2 dated 18.10.2012.



3 Counsel for the respondent-State submits that the appellate order, which is Annexure B to the counter affidavit, is a well considered and reasoned order. He points out from the same and other material on record that altogether five witnesses have supported the allegation that they have seen the petitioner returning 40 sheets of the missing rent receipts. He points out from the appellate order that the appellate authority has considered this fact and also the fact that the petitioner had tried to find discrepancy in the evidence given by the witnesses but there is no denial of the fact of return of rent receipts. It has also been taken note in the appellate order issued by the Commissioner that no attempt was made by the petitioner to produce any witness on his behalf or in his favour in the proceedings.

4 In view of the aforesaid facts, which are arising from the records of the proceedings, there is no occasion for this Court to interfere with the impugned order. The writ petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	08.01.2018
Transmission Date	NA

