

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 4739 of 2020

1. Rajshree Damu (Koshley) W/o Shri B.B.R. Damu, Aged About 43 Years R/o 27 Kholi, Near Rajrani Campus, Indrasen Nagar, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Line, Tahsil And District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Home (Police) Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, P.S. And Post Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director General Of Police (D.G.P.), Police Headquarter (P.H.Q.), Near Mahanadi Mantralaya, P.S. And Post Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Inspector General Of Police (I.G.P.)- A.A.V., Police Headquarter (P H Q), Near Mahanadi Mantralaya, P.S. And Post Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Zonal Superintendent Of Police, Office Of Zonal Superintendent Of Police, Special Branch, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Abhishek Pandey and Ms. Laxmeen Kashyap, Advocates.
For State	:	Shri Vivek Ranjan Tiwari, Addl. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

08.12.2020

1. The limited grievance that the petitioner has in the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondent no. 2 to consider the pending representation for upgradation of ACR for the year 2015- 16. The representation for the upgradation has been made on 21.08.2020.
2. The further prayer of the counsel for the petitioner is that in the course of deciding the representation, the authorities may be granted an opportunity of hearing; so that the petitioner would be able to convince the authorities; so far her claim for upgradation is concerned. The counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment of this Court of 2017 (2) CGLJ 433 in the case of Sudhram Deshlahra vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Ors, decided on 25.01.2017.

3. To the limited prayer that the counsel for the petitioner has made, the State counsel does not oppose.
4. In view of the contention made on either side, the present writ petition stands disposed off directing the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioner; so far as her upgradation and grading of ACR for the year 2015-16 is concerned. Keeping in view the aforesaid judgment in the case of Sudhram Deshlahra vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Ors, it is expected that the authorities may also consider granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner before taking a decision on the same.
5. The present writ petition, accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

inder