

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 23866 of 2013

=====

Ex L Nk Ved Prakash No 801261288, Son of Late Sh Chiranji Lal, Resident Of Village - Ghatesher, P.O. - Chhilaro, Teh - Mahendergarh, Haryana, Present Address, C/o Smt Santosh, H No RZH 404, Gali No 4, Raj Nagar, Part - II, Palam Colony, New Delhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, North Block, New Delhi
2. The Director General, CRPF, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi
3. The Deputy Inspector General Of Police, CRPF, Patna Range, Patna
4. The Commandant, 116 Btn CRPF, Durgapur, West Bengal
5. The DIG, CRPF, Muzaffarpur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Gagan Deo Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr Rajesh Kr Verma, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

2 23-05-2019 Matter has been listed today in the Summer Vacations as the learned counsel for the petitioner was desirous for consideration of his case during vacation.

The slip for listing was filed pursuant to notice dated 08th May 2019, published prior to the vacation.

Matter is, accordingly, taken up for consideration as both parties are present and willing to assist the Court for disposal of the matter.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents.



The nature of submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner are best left to be considered by the authorities themselves and no case is made out for exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

Brief background is that on allegation of obtaining appointment fraudulently, petitioner was removed from service. He now claims compassionate allowance relying upon the extant provisions contained in Rule 41 of CCS (Pension) Rules. The issue, which is to be examined, with reference to the nature of misconduct which has been proved against the petitioner having regard to the quantum of punishment taking into consideration mitigating/extenuating features, if any, in favour of the petitioner. This Court, therefore, does not propose to interfere in the matter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would approach respondent No 2 for consideration.

In view of the limited prayer made, writ petition is dismissed with liberty, as aforesaid.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

U			
---	--	--	--

