

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3402 of 2019

N.K. Dubey S/o Late Shri Bala Prasad Dubey Aged About 65 Years
Occupation-Sub Inspector (M) Retired Under The Office Of Director General
Of Police, Police Head Quarter, Raipur, R/o A-5, Vinayak Sadan, Panchvati
Colony, Akrity Vihar Amlidih, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Home Affairs, Police Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh,
2. The Secretary Finance (Home), Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Mantralaya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Director General Of Police, Police Head Quarters, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Additional Director General Of Police (Administration), Police Head Quarters, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Raghvendra Dwivedi, Occupation- Subedar (M) Working Under The Office Of Additional Inspector General Of Police Dantewada, District- Dantewada, Chhattisgarh
6. Motiram Verma Occupation -Subedar (M) Working Under The Office Of 7-B, Administration Branch, Police Head Quarter, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
7. Ganesh Ram Gond, Occupation- Subedar (M) Working Under The Office Of Planning/ Finance Department, Police Head Quarter, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vineet Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Mishra, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

07/05/2019

1. At the outset, the counsel for the petitioner submits that the writ petition itself may be disposed of with a direction to the respondents No. 3 & 4 to take an appropriate decision on the pending representation of the petitioner seeking promotion on the post of Subedar.
2. According to the petitioner, he stood retired from service as a Sub-Inspector (M) w.e.f. 31.01.2016, however he was entitled for promotion much earlier

and there was no disqualification as such for the petitioner for being denied promotion, therefore the department may consider the case of the petitioner at par with similarly placed persons.

3. The limited prayer of the petitioner for deciding the representation is not opposed by the State counsel. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of with a direction to the respondents No. 3 & 4 to take an appropriate decision on the pending representation that the petitioner has made seeking for promotion.
4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case. The respondents No.3 & 4 would be free to take a decision purely in accordance with the Rules and Regulations governing the field.
5. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved