

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (S) No.486 of 2024

Hari Karwa

.... **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The Union of India through Ministry of Railways represented through Secretary, New Delhi.
2. The principal Chief Engineer, South Eastern Railway, Kolkata, West Bengal.
3. Additional Divisional Railway Manager-cum-Revisional Authority, Chakradharpur, West Singhbhum.
4. Divisional Engineer-cum-Appellate Authority, South Eastern Railway, Chakradharpur, West Singhbhum.
5. Assistant Divisional Engineer-I, Tata Nagar, East Singhbhum.
6. Senior Section Engineer (P-Way), South Eastern Railway, Tata Nagar, Jamshedpur, East Singhbhum.

.... **Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vikas Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondents : Mr. Anil Kumar, ASGI

Mr. Shiv Kr. Sharma, Sr. Panel Counsel (U.O.I.)

02/Dated: 27th February, 2024

1. The present writ petition has been filed for following reliefs:-

“a. For issuance of appropriate writ/order/direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing order dated 17.03.2023 (Annexure-15) whereby and whereunder the mercy appeal preferred by the petitioner has been dismissed by respondent no.3;

b. For issuance of appropriate writ/order/direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing order dated 21.11.2022 (Annexure-14) whereby and whereunder the application for appeal against the order of disciplinary authority preferred by the petitioner has been dismissed by respondent no.4;

c. For issuance of appropriate writ/order/direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing order dated 26.11.2019 (Annexure-11) whereby and whereunder the disciplinary authority passed order of termination of petitioner from service;

d. For issuance of appropriate writ/order/direction for reinstatement of the petitioner to the post of Track Maintainer-III and further to make payment of arrears of salary as well as consequential benefits

And/Or

e. For any other appropriate writ/order/direction as Your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the interest of doing conscionable justice to the petitioner;”

2. After some arguments, it has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was in Central Services and as such jurisdiction lies with the Central Administrative Tribunal.

3. In view of above factual position, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition with a liberty to approach the Central Administrative Tribunal.

4. Permission is granted.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition is, hereby, dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Amar/-
Uploaded