

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.483 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District-

Surendra Prasad Son of Late Ram Chandra Sah, Resident of Mohalla-Salempur, Gola Road, P.S.- Barh, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Principal Secretary, Home Police Department, Government Of Bihar, Old
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Police Department, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Inspector General of Police, Central Zone, Patna.
5. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Central Range, Patna.
6. The Additional Superintendent of Police, Barh, Patna.
7. Sri Raj Kishore Singh, the then S.D.P.O., Barh.
8. The Officer Incharge Barh Police Station, Barh, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Nivedita Nirvikar, Sr. Adv. Mr. Amar Shakti
For the State	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, AC to Ex-GA 9
For Respondent No. 7	:	Mr. Ram Pravesh Nath Tiwari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- | | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 21 | 12-09-2025 | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, learned Counsel for the State and learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 7.2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has filed this criminal writ application for providing appropriate security to the petitioner and his family members and further to award compensation for the loss and damages caused to the petitioner by the |
|----|------------|---|

respondent no. 7, the then S.D.P.O., Barh. It has further been submitted that three pulse mills of the petitioner has been closed due to the highhandedness of the respondent no. 7 and the petitioner is entitled for compensation for loss and damages of his business. On the complaint of the petitioner against the respondent no. 7, a departmental proceeding was initiated by the police authorities and major punishment has been award to the respondent no. 7 of stoppage of three annual increments with cumulative effect and censure.

3. On the other hand, learned Counsel for the State as well as respondent no. 7 jointly argued that the relief of compensation for loss and damages may not be granted by this Court in its extra-ordinary writ jurisdiction. The respondent no. 7 was awarded punishment due to some irregularity in service of notice upon the petitioner. The respondent no. 7 had also been transferred from Barh to some other place in the year 2013 itself.
4. Having heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned and taking into consideration the nature of prayer made in the writ application, this Court is of the opinion that the compensation for loss and damages cannot be granted in

the facts of the present case.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is given liberty to take recourse to the alternative remedy before the competent court for his claim of compensation for the loss and damages in accordance with law.
6. With the aforesaid observation, this writ application is disposed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√		
---	---	--	--