

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3201 of 2020

=====

Narendra Kumar Ram Son of Late Bihari Ram Resident of Village-
Bhikharipur, P.S.- Narahi, District- Baliya, (U.P.).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Addl. Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna,
Home Department.
2. The Director General of Police State of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Inspector General Police Headquarter, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director General of Bihar Military Police Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sunil Pathak, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Saroj Kumar Sharma (AC to AAG-3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 07-12-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for the State are present.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for partial quashing of the order contained in Memo No. 8951 dated 26.07.2017 annexed as Annexure- 6 passed by the respondent no.3 where under he was re-approved and granted the petitioner's promotion with effect from 07.01.2002 on the post of Sub Inspector (Steno) the post on which the petitioner was promoted in Joint State of Bihar in which he was promoted in Bihar (prior to bifurcation), but all financial benefits granted from 2013 and for further, the date of petitioner's return in Bihar



grant of all consequential benefits with effect from 17.01.2002 including the revised pay scale granted with effect from 01.01.1996 vide order dated 07.12.2006 annexed as Annexure- 4 issued by the Deputy Secretary Finance, Bihar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that admittedly, the petitioner had worked since 2005 to 2013 in the State of Jharkhand, but subsequently, his service was returned back in the State of Bihar and the benefit was granted to him without actual payment of money of the period in which he was at Jharkhand.

4. It transpires to this Court that the petitioner has not filed any case when the cause of action has arisen, but has raised claim only in the year 2019 for which the petitioner has filed representation before the Deputy General of Police, but on his representation and copies to the Deputy Inspector General of Police and Inspector General, till date no decision has been taken.

5. Learned counsel for the State submits that though counter affidavit could not be filed in this case, but a direction may be given for disposal of the petitioner's representation.

6. In this background, respondent no.4 is directed to pass speaking order on petitioner's representation within six



months from the date of production of this order.

7. With this observation and directions, this writ
petition is hereby disposed of.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

