

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20439 of 2012

=====

Nayan Kumar Singh, Force No.943350020 Constable/GD, S/O Sri Tejendra Kumar Singh Resident Of Mohalla- Santnagar, Saharsa, Ward No.- 15, P.S.- Saharsa, District- Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through the Director General, Central Industrial Security Force, New Delhi
2. The Director General, Central Industrial Security Force, New Delhi
3. The Deputy Inspector General, Central Industrial Security Force, Eastern Zone, Patna
4. The Group Commandant, Central Industrial Security Force, Group Head Quarter, Patliputra, Boring Road, Patna- 13
5. Sri Umesh Chandra Bhawal, Assistant Commandant, Central Industrial Security Force, Unit F.C.I., Dighaghat (Removed), At Present CISF Unit, Dae Kalpalam, District- Chengatpet, Tamilnadu

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Navin Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dr. K. N. Singh, ASG
		Mr. Ram Tujabh Singh, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2024 Heard the parties.

2. Petitioner has *inter alia* prayed for following reliefs

in the paragraphs No.1 of the writ petition:-

(I) For issuance of appropriate writ for quashing the order contained in letter no.1263 dated 28.07.2011 passed by the Assistant Commandant, Central Industrial Force, CISI UNIT FCI (FSC) Dighaghat, Patna (now removed) whereby the petitioner has been given punishment of fine equivalent to three days pay.

(ii) For quashing the order no.82 dated 04.01.2012 passed by the Group Commandant, CISF Group Head Quarter, Patna whereby the Memok of



appeal preferred by the petitioner against the aforesaid order of Assistant Commandant dated 28.07.2011 has been rejected.

(iii) For quashing the order no. 4588 dated 07.05.2012 passed by the Deputy Inspector General Eastern Zone, Head Quarter, Patna whereby the revision petition filed by the petitioner against the aforesaid order dated 04.01.2012 has been rejected.

(iv) Any other relief or reliefs the petitioner is entitled.”

3. Considering the fact that the petitioner is posted in a disciplined service, I don't find it proper to interfere in any manner with the penalty order, as the petitioner has not been able to make out a case to show any perversity in the penalty order.

4. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

