

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13322 of 2008

=====

Ranjeet Kumar Jha, aged about 37 years, son of Shree Harendra Jha, Resident of Village – Fatehabad, P.S. - Senduari, District - Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1) Union Of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
- 2) The Director General, Central Reserve Police Force, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
- 3) The Inspector General, Central Reserve Police Force, Bihar Sector, Patna.
- 4) The Inspector General, Central Reserve Police Force, Sri. Nagar.
- 5) The Deputy Inspector General, Central Reserve Police Force, Bihar Sector, Patna,
- 6) The Deputy Inspector General, Central Reserve Police Force, Sri Nagar.
- 7) The Commandant, 21 Batallion, CRPF, C/o 56 APO, Sri Nagar.
- 8) Sri Ravindra Singh, Asst. Commandant, CRPF 21 Batalian, Sri Nagar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mahesh Narayan, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Sanjay Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Raj Kamal, CGC

=====

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

Date : 15-02-2023

Heard learned counsels for the respective parties.

2. In the instant petition, petitioner has prayed for the following relief/reliefs:

“(i) For quashing of order dated 02.08.2008 (Annex – 1) issued under the seal and signature of Respondent No. 7 whereby and whereunder the said Respondent No. 7 under the purported exercise of power U/S 11 (I) of the CRPF Act, 1949 read with Rule 27 of the Rules has been pleased to award the petitioner a punishment by reducing by two stage from Rs. 4050/- to Rs. 3880/- for a period of three years w.e.f. the date of issue of the impugned order and further putting a ban on petitioner’s



increment of pay during the period of reduction and that on the expiry of this period.

(ii) For directing the respondents not to give operation of the order dated 02.08.2008 (Annex-1) till the final outcome of the present writ petition.

(iii) For a declaration that in the facts and position of two applicable in this case, respondents are not obliged to impose such a harsh punishment which affects the petitioners right to livelihood.

(iv) Any other relief or reliefs as deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. For remaining unauthorized absent for some time, petitioner was subjected to disciplinary proceedings and it was concluded in imposition of penalty of withholding of increments and it was subject matter of appeal. Thereafter, he has presented the present petition.

4. The petitioner has not made out a *prima facie* case so as to interfere with the impugned orders. That apart, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instruction, submitted that petitioner was dismissed from service in another inquiry. In view of these facts and circumstances, present petition stands dismissed.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

GAURAV S./-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	17.02.2023
Transmission Date	

