

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 1390 of 2022**

=====

Ram Khelawan Ravidas, Son of Late Hari Ravidas, Resident of Village -  
Bharaupar South to Mosque, Police Station Laheri, District - Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Secretary, General Administration Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Under Secretary, General Administration Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
4. The Accountant General, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Anwar Karim, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr M Nasrul Huda Khan, SC I

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 04-11-2022**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents through Virtual Mode.

**2** Petitioner's counsel submits that the impugned order dated 08.06.2021 is not sustainable in the eyes of law.

**3** The petitioner was proceeded against in a duly constituted departmental proceedings under Resolution dated 21.06.1995. The petitioner, as a result of the departmental proceedings, was dismissed from service. The allegations being



creation of *Jamabandi* in respect of *Ghair Mazarua Khas Lands*, nearly 700 acres.

4 The petitioner was proceeded against by the Enquiry Officer and afforded an opportunity of second show cause and finally the order of punishment was passed on 06.07.1999. It is apparent from the pleadings of the writ petition that in respect of the allegations, the petitioner was also proceeded against by way of a vigilance case.

5 Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been acquitted in the vigilance case by the trial Court under order dated 14.06.2018 passed in Special Case No 27 of 1992 by the Court of Special Judge, Vigilance (ACB), Hazaribagh, which now lies in the State of Jharkhand. He submits that in view of acquittal in the criminal case, the petitioner should be given all consequential benefits treating his dismissal to be legally unsustainable.

6 The petitioner had moved the authorities with similar prayer by way of representation which has been rejected by order dated 08.06.2021 by the General Administration Department. The petitioner's counsel has not pointed out any infirmity in the proceedings conducted against him and his submission is only that since the petitioner has been acquitted in the criminal case, he is



entitled to be reinstated with all consequential benefits by holding the order of dismissal dated 06.07.1999 to be illegal.

7 No case has been made out in any way assailing the legality of the termination order recorded in a duly constituted proceedings, based on preponderance of probabilities.

8 Writ petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | NA         |
| Uploading Date    | 02.12.2022 |
| Transmission Date | NA         |

