

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11139 of 2010

Shiv Shankar Sah S/O Sri Ram Swaroop Sah R/O Vill.- Bahilwara Dhanushi,
P.S. Runni Saidpur, Distt.- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of Inida And Ors
2. Secretary, Ministry Of Defence, Govt. Of India, New Delhi
3. Director General Of Police, Central Reserve Police Force, Cgo Complex,
Lodhi Road, New Delhi
4. Inspector General Of Police, Western Sector, Central Reserve Police Force,
Navi Mumbai
5. Deputy Inspector General Of Police, Central Reserve Police Force, Pune
6. Commandant- 79 Battalian, Central Reserve Police Force, Srinagar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :

For the Respondent/UOI

CRPF : Mr. Anshuman Singh, CGC

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
ORAL ORDER

8 18-07-2022 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner.

On 11.07.2022, following order was passed :

“No one appears on behalf of the petitioner.

The petitioner has assailed the orders issued
by the Commandant-79 Battalion, Central Reserve Police
Force, Srinagar and Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Central Reserve Police Force, Pune and further revisional
order passed by the Inspector General of Police, Western
Sector, Central Reserve Police Force, Navi Mumbai.

It is learnt that petitioner while working in
Commandant-79 Battalion, Central Reserve Police Force,



Srinagar, he was punished in imposition of penalty of dismissal from service. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied with the order of dismissal, he had preferred appeal before the appellate authority – Deputy Inspector General of Police, Central Reserve Police Force, Pune and further revision before IGP, Western Sector, C.R.P.F, Navi Mumbai. All three orders are subject matter of this petition.

I find *prima facie* that the present petition is not maintainable on the ground of territorial jurisdiction. On this issue, learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner is hereby directed to apprise on the next date of hearing. If there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner on the next date of hearing, petition would be dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

Re-list this matter on 18.07.2022.”

In the light of decision passed by this Court in the case of **Ashutosh Ranjan vs. The Union of India and Others** in **C.W.J.C. No. 11139 of 2018** decided on 27.04.2022, the present petition is not maintainable on the ground of territorial jurisdiction.

Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed

The petitioner is at liberty to approach jurisdictional forum. In the event of invoking the territorial jurisdiction Court,



the jurisdictional Court may consider Section 14 of the limitation act for the purpose of condonation of delay in invoking appropriate jurisdictional forum.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

GAURAV S./-

U			
---	--	--	--

