

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5422 of 2003

-
-
1. Satyendra Narain @ Satyendra Narain Singh son of Late Jhalakdeo Sharma, resident of Village Shiyarampur, P.S. Paliganj, Patna at present posted as Constable in Nawada S.P.'s Office, Nawada (Constable no. 318).
 2. Satyendra Narain Singh son of Sri Rajdeo Singh, resident of Village-Dhankaul, P.S. Makadumpur, District Jehanabad, at present posted as Constable in Police Line, Nawada (Constable No.263).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Director General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna Region, Patna.
3. Inspector General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna Region, Patna.
4. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Magadh Range, Gaya.
5. Superintendent of Police, Nawadah.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Abhanjali, AC to GA 12.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-04-2019

The present writ petition was initially filed for setting aside the show cause notice dated 25.04.2003 whereby and whereunder the petitioners herein were directed to submit their reply as to why their services should not be terminated on account of certain illegality being discovered in the selection process. However, in the meantime, it appears that the services of the petitioners were terminated vide orders dated 4.6.2004 and 30.6.2004, whereafter, the petitioners had filed an amendment petition, challenging the said order and the writ petition stood amended.

2. The brief facts of the case are that an advertisement was issued in the year 1989 and after holding the selection process, the respondents had appointed the petitioners vide letter dated 19.06.1990



as constable and thereafter, the petitioners continued to work to the satisfaction of all concerned, however, suddenly, the respondents had issued a show cause notice dated 25.04.2003 directing the petitioners to submit their reply as to why their services should not be terminated on account of certain illegalities being discovered in the selection process, hence, the same had led to filing of the present writ petition. However, during the pendency of the present writ petition, the services of the petitioners were terminated vide order dated 4.6.2004 and 30.6.2004, after the petitioners had served the respondents for about 14 years.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that similarly situated Constables, whose services had been terminated, had also approached this Court and this Court by a judgment dated 02.07.2008 passed in L.P.A. No. 221 of 2008, had affirmed the order passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby and whereunder the order of termination had been quashed. The learned counsel for the petitioners has also referred to the order dated 03.02.2003 passed in WP(S) no. 2087 of 2002, wherein also the cases of similarly situated persons has been allowed and the order of termination has been quashed, primarily on the ground that the writ petitioners had worked for about 14 years and there was no justification to issue show cause notice after 14 years of service and to terminate the services merely on the ground that the rules provided in the Police Manual, were not followed. The learned counsel for the petitioners has also relied upon the judgments passed by the learned Division Bench of this Court, reported in *(1994)2 BLJ 499*



(**Ashok Kumar & Ors. vs. State of Bihar & Ors.**) and the one reported in (2004) 1 BLJ 733 (**State of Bihar & Ors. v. Sudhanshu Shekhar Mullick**) to contend that though the initial appointment of the incumbents may be wrong but as the incumbents have not obtained appointment by means of any forgery or misrepresentation, the validity of appointment cannot be challenged or opened after a lapse of 12 years.

4. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that as far as the petitioner no.1 is concerned, he is still continuing in service and has also been promoted to the post of A.S.I. However, the petitioner no.2 is not in service at the moment. Lastly, it is submitted that the present case is squarely covered by a judgment dated 28.8.2018 passed by this Court in CWJC No. 8739 of 2003 and other similar type of cases.

5. The learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute the fact that the case of the similarly situated petitioners has already been allowed by this Court and the order of termination has been set aside.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials on record and I find that the present case is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgments passed from time to time in various cases, hence this Court has no option but to allow the present writ petition and quash the orders of termination dated 4.6.2004 and 30.06.2004.



7. The writ petition is allowed and the orders of termination dated 04.06.2004 qua the petitioner no.1 and 30.4.2004 pertaining to the petitioner no.2 are quashed.

8. As far as the petitioner no.1 is concerned, since he is already in service, there is no need to direct for payment of his back wages. However, as far as the petitioner no.2 is concerned, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that if not 100%, at least 50% back wages be allowed to the petitioner no.2 since the order of termination has been found to be illegal. This Court is of the opinion that interest of justice would be met, in case 50% back wages are directed to be paid to the petitioner no.2 along with continuity in service for the purposes of retiral benefits.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Tiwary/-

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

