

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15143 of 2014

Janardan Singh Son of Sri Ramadhar Singh, Resident of village- Koriar, P.O. Purhara, P.S.- Chouri, Distt- Bhojpur at Arah

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Director General of Police, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Inspector General of Police, Bihar Military Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The Deputy Inspector General of Police Personnel, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
5. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, B.M.P. Central Region, Patna
6. The Commandant Bihar Military Police- 14, Patna

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. I M.K.Sinha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

6 09-08-2024 Petitioner has *inter alia* prayed for following reliefs in
the paragraphs No.1 of the writ petition:-

“That this is an application for the quashing of the order contained in Memo No.2773 dated 27/9/2013 passed and issued by the Commandant, Bihar Military Police-14, Patna by which he has dismissed the petitioner from the post of ARMOURER HAWALDAR.

And

For quashing of the order contained in Memo No.143, dated 7/2/2014 whereby and whereunder appeal filed by the petitioner against the dismissal has been rejected by the Deputy Inspector General of Police (C.R.), Patna

And

Further for quashing of the order



*contained in Memo No.3408, dated 9/7/2014
whereby and whereunder Revision
Application/Appeal Memorial filed by the
petitioner has been rejected by the Director
General of Police, Government of Bihar, Patna*

AND

*For payment of due salary of
November and December 2005, January to August
2006 increment of salary 2011. Salary for May
2013 to 26/9/2013 with all consequential
benefits.”*

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submitted that it is the case of the petitioner that petitioner was not provided with proper opportunity of hearing and he was not served the evidences in support of the charges.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submitted that the disciplinary proceeding was initiated against the petitioner on the ground of five charges, out of which two charges were proved in relation to his unauthorized absence from duty. The petitioner was also facing trial in connection with Arrah (Nawadah) P.S. Case No.246 of 2005. The disciplinary proceeding was carried in accordance with the provision of law.

4. Having considered the pleadings made in the writ petition, as well as, in the counter affidavit, I find that petitioner



was given due opportunity of hearing and it is admitted by the petitioner that he was convicted in a criminal case and he has not been able to find out any perversity in the impugned order, I am not inclined to interfere in any manner with the penalty order and as a consequence of the same, the appellate order and revisional order are also upheld.

5.The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

