

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WA No. 16 of 2020

(Arising out of order dated 18/10/2019 passed by learned Single Judge in WPC No. 3727 of 2019)

- Jubeen Dubey son of Shri Pradip Kumar Dubey, aged about 26 years, R/o Ward No. 27, Behind Bus Station Kawardha, District Kabirdham, C.G.

-----Appellant/petitioner

VERSUS

1. State of Chhattisgarh through- The Chief Secretary, Government of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur C.G.
2. The Secretary, Home Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, C.G.
3. Union of India, through- The Secretary, Home Affairs, Government of India, VIP Security Unit, Room No. 8, 2nd Floor, M.D.C. National Stadium India Gate Circle, New Delhi.
4. Director General of Police, Police Head Quarter Raipur, District Raipur C.G.
5. Superintendent of Police, SP Office, Kawardha, District Kabirdham C.G.

-----Respondents

For Appellant	:	Mr. Pramod Ramteke, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Sudeep Agrawal, Dy.A.G.
For Respondent No. 3,4,5	:	Ms. Parwati Suryawanshi, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Bhupendra Singh, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri P.R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per P.R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice.

09/01/2020

1. Writ petitioner is the appellant before this Court. Grievance is against the verdict passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the prayers raised in the writ petition were turned down with regard to issuance of experience certificate, remuneration and such other reliefs, pursuant to service availed from the petitioner as a Cyber Expert to resolve various issues of the State/Police.

2. The prayers made in the writ petition are in the following terms:

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to take appropriate steps in furtherance of the letter dated 14.11.2018.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to give the experience certificate (Prashasti Patra) for his work for such a long period to the investigation agency of the Country.

10.3 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly direct the respondent authorities to grant the reward to the petitioner for his workdone for the state as well as the central investigation agency.

10.4 That, the respondent authorities may kindly be directed to protect the life and future of the petitioner who has given most important part of the life to the investigation agency against the terrorist and naxalites.

10.5 Any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper, may kindly be granted to the petitioner, in the interest of justice.”

3. After considering the pleadings and prayers, the learned Single Judge observed that no material was produced with regard to the terms of engagement and on the other hand, the available materials revealed that the service rendered by the petitioner to the respondents was voluntary. In the absence of any agreement or contract entered into between any of the respondents and the petitioner, it was held as difficult to direct the respondents to grant the reliefs sought for. It was accordingly, that interference was declined and the writ petition was disposed of, however, with the liberty to the petitioner to move the respondent authorities on the administrative side, projecting his grievance and to have the same considered. We do not find anything wrong as to the course pursued by the learned Single Judge.
4. In view of the liberty granted by the learned Single Judge to the petitioner to move the respondent authorities for redressal of his grievance, the present

appeal stands dismissed, making the direction given in paragraph-4 of the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge absolute.

Sd/-
(P.R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Pawan