

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6578 of 2019

=====

Mahesh Kumar Choudhary, aged 41 years, male, Son of Shri Ram Balak Chaudhary, resident of Village Raghunandanpur, P.S. Bhagwanpur, District-Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India New Delhi.
3. The Inspector General-Cum-Revisonal Authority, Central Reserve Police Force, Bihar Sector, Ashiana Digha Road, Patna.
4. The Deputy Inspector General-Cum-Appellate Authority, Central Reserve Police Force, Ashiana Digha Road Patna.
5. The Commandant, 22nd Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force, Bazar Samiti Hazaribagh, Jharkhand.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanat Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.D. Sanjay, Addl. S.G.
Ms. Renuka Singh, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 23-04-2019

The petitioner, who served as Constable/Driver, was subjected to a domestic proceeding for the charge of looking for killing someone under the state of drunkenness.



The charges were proved in the domestic proceeding and the Disciplinary Authority punished the petitioner by removing him from service. The Appeal against the order of the Disciplinary Authority was rejected and so was the fate of the Memorial preferred by the petitioner.

2. The petitioner, thereafter, approached this Court *vide* C.W.J.C. No. 17537 of 2015, which too was dismissed by order dated 07.03.2018, but with a liberty to the petitioner to approach the Inspector General of Police to reconsider the quantum of sentence. The order, however, specified that any order on such representation for a revisit of quantum of sentence, shall finally conclude the issue.

3. The representation which was filed by the petitioner before the Inspector General of Police for a re-look at the quantum of sentence has been rejected *vide* order dated 23.04.2018, which has has been impugned in the present petition.

4. A perusal of the order impugned clearly reflects that after applying his mind to the gravity of the charges against the petitioner and other relevant factors, a



decision has been taken to reject the representation of the petitioner.

5. This Court does not find any fault with the order impugned.

6. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	26.04.2019
Transmission Date	N/A

