

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 4701 of 2020**

1. Rajshree Damu (Koshley), Wife of 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**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
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
3. Inspector General of Police (I.G.P.)-A.A.V., Police Headquarter (PHQ), Near Mahanadi Mantralaya, P.S. And Post - Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Zonal Superintendent of Police, Office of Zonal Superintendent of Police, Special Branch, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Abhishek Pandey, Advocate along with Ms. Laxmeen Kashyap, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Sudeep Verma, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****04.12.2020**

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 2016-17. 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 2016-17 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