

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5758 of 2020

=====

Satyendra Nath Lal, Son of Late Keshab Prasad Lal, Resident of Flat No. 202,
'B' Block Jagmano Shree Garden, Mohalla Ved Nagar, P.S. Rupaspur, Town
and District: Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Revenue, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Appellate Authority cum Minister, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Additional Collector cum Inquiring Officer, Patna.
6. The Senior Deputy Collector, Patna.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Akhilesh Dutta Verma, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Navneet Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
CAV JUDGMENT

Date : 07-02-2025

This Court has heard Mr. Akhilesh Dutta Verma, learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Navneet Kumar, learned Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved with the order dated 07.09.2018 as contained in Memo No. 782 (Annexure-26), whereby the petitioner has been dismissed from his services based upon the findings of the departmental enquiry. The Service Appeal bearing no. 27 of 2018-19 preferred by the petitioner also came to be rejected vide order dated 20.02.2020 by the Minister-cum-Appellate Authority, Department of



Revenue, Government of Bihar (Annexure-28), which order is also put to challenge in the present writ petition.

3. The brief summary of the facts as culled out from the materials available on record, are enumerated hereinbelow:

(i) The petitioner was appointed as Assistant Consolidation Officer in the year 1991. On abolition of the Department of Consolidation, service of the petitioner was transferred to Department of Revenue and he was posted as Circle Inspector. While the petitioner was posted as Circle Inspector, Maner, he received a letter on 19.03.2008 by Circle Officer, Maner endorsed to Halka Karamchari, Shri Chandresh Rajak along with a complaint of villagers of Maner regarding unauthorized filling up a pond situated at Maner Bazar for grabbing the same.

(ii) An enquiry was conducted with respect to the land in question appertaining to Thana No. 34, Khata No. 587, Plot No. 189 area 0.85 decimal and Khata No. 587, Plot No. 190, Area 2.61 decimal. After due verification and enquiry, a report was submitted on 27.03.2008 that both the plots of the land in question are recorded in Survey Khatian in the nature of Gairmazarua Mallik (Bhind Pokhar Kazi Talab).

(iii) The petitioner being Circle Inspector, on



verification of the record, reported to the Circle Officer, Maner on 27.03.2008 that the land in question was Gairmazarua Mallik as per the Survey Khatiyan.

(iv) On 04.05.2008, one Navnit Sinha, lodged a complaint before the SHO, Vigilance alleging therein that the land in question is Khatiyani land and has been coming in his possession. However, when he was engaged in developing the land in question, the petitioner along with Halka Karamchari and the Circle Officer restrained him to do the work and demanded Rs.8,00,000/-(eight lakh).

(v) On the basis of such complaint, a trap team was constituted and the petitioner was apprehended on 04.05.2008 while accepting a bribe of Rs.50,000/-, leading to institution of Vigilance P.S. Case No. 22 of 2008 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 7/13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988; the petitioner was taken into judicial custody and sent to jail.

(vi) In the aforesaid premise, the petitioner was put under suspension w.e.f. 04.05.2008. Subsequently, the petitioner released from the judicial custody on 08.08.2008. The petitioner submitted his joining on 12.08.2008 before the Divisional Commissioner, Patna. The joining of the petitioner was accepted and



he was posted at Survey Office, Patna.

(vii) On 14.02.2014, the petitioner was again placed under suspension in contemplation of a departmental proceeding and a memo of charge (Prapatra 'K') served upon him on 26.03.2014 under the signature of the District Magistrate, Patna. Further the Principal Secretary issued another letter on 26.04.2014 annexing the memo of charge duly issued by the District Magistrate, Patna. The Additional Collector (Departmental Enquiry) was appointed as Conducting Officer and a request was made to the District Magistrate to appoint a Presenting Officer at his own level. On a request made by the Conducting Officer, the Deputy Collector, Establishment was appointed as a Presenting Officer. Whereupon a show-cause explanation was asked from the petitioner annexing the memo of charge. In response thereto, the petitioner filed a petition on 05.05.2014 and prayed for providing the copy of the relevant documents in relation to the charges levelled against him. The Conducting Officer directed the Presenting Officer for supplying the relevant documents. In response to the direction afore-noted, the Presenting Officer supplied the complaint petition of the complainant, pre-trap memo, post trap memo, photocopy of the case diary and statement of Prakash Nath



Mishra, the then SHO Vigilance, Police, to the petitioner. The petitioner further requested for supply of the document related to the memo of charge and list of witnesses on 21.05.2014. The petitioner also filed several petitions as has been disclosed in the writ petition for supply of necessary relevant papers in order to submit his effective show-cause explanation. However, those papers could not be supplied to the petitioner and finally the petitioner has submitted his detailed show-cause reply on 12.07.2014, denying all the charges.

(viii) The Conducting Officer after completion of the enquiry, found the charges proved against the petitioner and submitted the enquiry report dated 13.10.2014 to the disciplinary authority. The petitioner was served with a second show-cause notice by the disciplinary authority on 21.11.2014. The petitioner submitted his response to the second show-cause notice refuting all the allegations and the opinion expressed by the Conducting Officer. Ultimately, the disciplinary authority passed the impugned order of punishment and dismissed the services of the petitioner vide Memo No. 782 dated 07.09.2018.

(ix) The petitioner, aggrieved with the impugned order of punishment, preferred Service Appeal No. 27 of 2018 before the Appellate Authority-cum-Minister, Department of Revenue,



Government of Bihar, which came to be rejected vide order dated 20.02.2020.

4. Mr. Verma, learned Advocate for the petitioner while assailing the impugned order has submitted that much prior to the complaint filed by the complainant Navnit Sinha, Halka Karamchari and the petitioner reported to the Circle Officer about the nature of the land in question as Gairmazarua Mallik. Thus, there was no occasion either for the Halka Karamchari or the petitioner to demand and accept Rs.50,000/- as a bribe money. The matter was also inquired by the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Danapur, who submitted his report to the S.D.O., Danapur that the land in question was not the Khatiyani land of the complainant and it is the clandestine move of the complainant to grab the land, which resulted into initiation of a proceeding under Sections 144/145 of the CrPC. The land in question was duly attached and Officer in-charge, Maner P.S. was appointed as a receiver of the said plot. On a report submitted by the S.D.O., Danapur, a Jamabandi Cancellation Case No. 87/2014-15 was initiated against the complainant and vide order dated 16.05.2016, the said Jamabandi was cancelled by the Additional District Collector, Patna. Referring to the aforesaid fact, it is contended that at no



point of time, either the petitioner has made any collusive report in order to extend the benefit to the complainant or he being Circle Inspector was anyhow responsible for either mutation or Jamabandi.

5. After taking this Court through the memo of charge and the enquiry report, learned Advocate for the petitioner further contended that the District Magistrate, Patna was neither the appointing authority of the petitioner nor his disciplinary authority and, as such, the issuance of the memo of charge by him was wholly without jurisdiction. Moreover, the departmental proceeding was initiated without holding any preliminary enquiry and asking any show-cause to the petitioner contrary to the provisions of the Bihar Government Servants (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 2005 (for short 'the Rules, 2005'). It is further contended that the memo of charge as contained in Annexure-10 to the writ petition is not in consonance with rule 17(3) and (4) of the Rules, 2005, inasmuch as there is no list of witnesses. The necessary relevant documents in relation to the charges have also not been supplied to the petitioner and thus he has been deprived from fair opportunity of hearing. Without furnishing the necessary papers/documents, the petitioner was compelled to file his



show-cause explanation, though the same has been filed but it has not been taken into consideration by the Conducting Officer while holding the charges proved against the petitioner.

6. The Enquiry Officer admitted the fact that the petitioner has rightly submitted his report showing the land in question as Gairmazarua Mallik and, *prima facie*, it appears that on protest being made by the petitioner and other State officials, the complainant had filed such complaint but from the aforesaid fact, no conclusion can be drawn that no demand has been made by the petitioner when from the materials and evidence clearly show that the petitioner was apprehended by the trap team while accepting bribe. Based upon the aforesaid fact, the Enquiry Officer has submitted the report. There is no witness, much less even the complainant and the members of the trap team were examined by the department to prove the charges. Heavy reliance has been placed on a decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Roop Singh Negi v. Punjab National Bank and Others [(2009) 2 SCC 570]**. Reliance has also been placed on a decision rendered by this Court in the cases of **Vijendra Prasad v. State of Bihar and Others [2019 BLJ 6 751]** and **Arun Kumar v. State of Bihar and Others [2019 BLJ 3 221]** that any disciplinary proceeding without



following the statutory provisions of Rule 17 of the Rules, 2005, the same is unsustainable and the impugned orders of punishment are fit to be set aside.

7. Learned Advocate for the petitioner also contended that the disciplinary authority has failed to consider the show-cause explanation filed by the petitioner before inflicting the major punishment of dismissal and only affirm the recommendation of the Conducting Officer. There is no application of mind and the impugned order is perverse, rest upon no evidence; similar mistake has been done by the appellate authority while dismissing the memo of appeal preferred by the petitioner. It is lastly contended that the respondent authorities have completely failed to follow the prescriptions provided under Rules, 2005, especially Rules, 14, 15, 17 and 18 thereof.

8. While summing up the submissions, learned Advocate for the petitioner further contended that now the petitioner has already superannuated on 29.02.2020 and, as such, if the case of the petitioner finds favour, it ought not to be remanded for the purposes of fresh enquiry or departmental proceeding. To support the aforesaid contention, reliance has also been placed on the decisions rendered by the learned



Division Bench of this Court in **L.P.A. No. 389 of 2024 [Ram Lagan Ram v. The State of Bihar and Others]** and further in **L.P.A. No. 446 of 2024 [The State of Bihar and Others v. Vikash Kumar @ Vikas Kumar]**.

9. Mr. Navenet Kumar, learned Advocate for the State, *per contra*, submitted that it is an open and shut case. The petitioner was caught red handed while accepting the bribe of Rs.50,000/- from the complainant. Before initiation of the departmental proceeding, deliberation was done at the level of the department and whereupon the proceeding was initiated after issuance of proper memo of charge under Rule 17(2) of the Rules, 2005. The Enquiry Officer and the Presenting Officer were duly appointed and the petitioner has been handed over necessary documents and has also been given proper opportunity of hearing. After thorough enquiry, the Enquiry Officer found the charges proved against the petitioner. Whereupon, the petitioner has been served with second show-cause notice along with the copy of the enquiry report vide letter no. 820 dated 21.11.2014. The second show-cause reply of the petitioner was duly considered by the disciplinary authority and on being found the petitioner guilty for the charges levelled against him, inflicted with the punishment of dismissal with a



clear observation that the petitioner shall not be eligible for any further employment. The appeal preferred by the petitioner also did not find any merit and it has rightly been rejected. Submitting the aforesaid facts, it is contended that the impugned orders do not require any interference, as the same has been passed by following all the procedures and giving proper opportunity of hearing.

10. This Court has anxiously heard the submissions advanced on behalf of the learned Advocates for the parties and meticulously perused the materials available on record.

11. Before parting with this case, it would be apt and proper to highlight the mandatory prescriptions of the Rules, 2005, which are required to be followed in a departmental enquiry/proceeding.

12. Rule 17 of the Rules, 2005 prescribes the procedure for imposing major penalties. Rule 17(1) and (2) obligate the Disciplinary Authority that no order imposing any of the penalties specified in rule 14 shall be made without holding an enquiry, in the manner provided in these rules. If disciplinary authority is of the opinion that there are grounds for inquiring about the truth of any imputation of misconduct or misbehaviour against a government servant, he may himself



inquire into it, or appoint under these Rules an authority to inquire about the truth thereof. Rule 17(3) further directs that in order to hold an inquiry against a government servant under this Rule, the disciplinary authority shall draw up or cause to be drawn up the substance of the imputations of misconduct or misbehaviour as a definite and distinct article of charge to support each article of charge. Memo of charge shall contain a list of such documents by which and a list of such witnesses by whom, the articles of charge are proposed to be sustained. A copy of article of charge with the statement of imputation of misconduct or misbehaviour and list of documents and witnesses shall be delivered to the government servant with a direction to submit written statement of his/her defence. The duty is also cast upon the enquiring authority to produce the necessary documents to the delinquent provided that the enquiring authority may, for reasons to be recorded by it in writing, refuse to requisition such of the documents as are, in its opinion, not relevant to the case.

13. Suffice it to observe that Rule 17(5) of the Rules, 2005 clearly mandates that on receipt of the written statement of defence, the disciplinary authority may himself inquire into such of the article of charge, which are not admitted or it fit thinks



necessary to appoint under Sub-rule 2 of this Rule; an enquiry authority for the purpose he may do so.

14. Rule 17(14) of the Rules, 2005 clearly mandates that on the date fixed for the inquiry, the oral and documentary evidence by which the articles of charge are proposed to be proved shall be produced by or on behalf of the disciplinary authority. The witnesses shall be examined by or on behalf of the Presenting Officer and may be cross-examined by or on behalf of the Government Servant. The Presenting Officer shall be entitled to re-examine the witnesses on any points on which they have been cross-examined, but not on any new matter, without the leave of the inquiring authority. The inquiring authority may also put such questions to the witnesses, as it thinks fit.

15. The aforesaid provisions obligate the disciplinary authority to make a preliminary enquiry before the initiation of a departmental proceeding and issuance of the memo of charge. In the present case, the disciplinary authority has failed to exercise his duty.

16. In the case in hand, the memo of charge does not contain the list of witnesses; even the list of documents only contains two letters; (i) issued by the Principal Secretary,



Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar contained in Memo No. 379 dated 03.06.2008 and (ii) Memo No. 508 dated 12.05.2008 issued by the Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Bihar. Neither the complaint nor the other relevant documents relating to the charge have been included in the list of documents, though later on, a copy of the complaint petition, pre and post trap memorandum and the case diary have been handed over to the petitioner.

17. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in innumerable decisions has held that recording of evidence in a disciplinary proceeding to uphold the charges of major punishment is *sine qua non*.

18. In the case of **Roop Singh Negi** (supra), while dealing with the identical issue has held "*the purported evidence collected during investigation by the investigating officer against the accused by itself could not be treated to be evidence in disciplinary proceeding. The charges levelled against the delinquent officer must be found to have been proved on the basis of the evidence.*" The Hon'ble Court made it clear that the report of the Enquiry Officer could not be sustained if it is based upon merely *ipse dixit* as also surmises and conjectures. The inferences drawn by the Enquiry Officer



should apparently supported by any evidence. Suspicion, however high may be, can under no circumstances be held to be a substitute for legal proof.

19. It would be apt and proper to encapsulate the relevant paragraphs of the said judgment for appreciation of the issue:

“14. Indisputably, a departmental proceeding is a quasi-judicial proceeding. The enquiry officer performs a quasi-judicial function. The charges levelled against the delinquent officer must be found to have been proved. The enquiry officer has a duty to arrive at a finding upon taking into consideration the materials brought on record by the parties. The purported evidence collected during investigation by the investigating officer against all the accused by itself could not be treated to be evidence in the disciplinary proceeding. No witness was examined to prove the said documents. The management witnesses merely tendered the documents and did not prove the contents thereof. Reliance, inter alia, was placed by the enquiry officer on the FIR which could not have been treated as evidence.

23. Furthermore, the order of the disciplinary authority as also the appellate authority are not supported by any reason. As the orders passed by them have severe civil consequences, appropriate reasons should have been assigned. If the enquiry



officer had relied upon the confession made by the appellant, there was no reason as to why the order of discharge passed by the criminal court on the basis of selfsame evidence should not have been taken into consideration. The materials brought on record pointing out the guilt are required to be proved. A decision must be arrived at on some evidence, which is legally admissible. The provisions of the Evidence Act may not be applicable in a departmental proceeding but the principles of natural justice are. As the report of the enquiry officer was based on merely ipse dixit as also surmises and conjectures, the same could not have been sustained. The inferences drawn by the enquiry officer apparently were not supported by any evidence. Suspicion, as is well known, however high may be, can under no circumstances be held to be a substitute for legal proof.”

20. In the case of **State of Uttar Pradesh and Others v. Saroj Kumar Sinha [(2010) 2 SCC 772]**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has highlighted the status and duties of the Enquiry Officer by holding that the employee should be treated fairly in any proceeding which may culminate in punishment being imposed upon him.

21. It would be apt and proper to reproduce the relevant paragraphs of the said decision, which are as under:



“27. A bare perusal of the aforesaid sub-rule shows that when the respondent had failed to submit the explanation to the charge-sheet it was incumbent upon the inquiry officer to fix a date for his appearance in the inquiry. It is only in a case when the government servant despite notice of the date fixed failed to appear that the inquiry officer can proceed with the inquiry ex parte. Even in such circumstances it is incumbent on the inquiry officer to record the statement of witnesses mentioned in the charge-sheet. Since the government servant is absent, he would clearly lose the benefit of cross-examination of the witnesses. But nonetheless in order to establish the charges the Department is required to produce the necessary evidence before the inquiry officer. This is so as to avoid the charge that the inquiry officer has acted as a prosecutor as well as a judge.

28. An inquiry officer acting in a quasi-judicial authority is in the position of an independent adjudicator. He is not supposed to be a representative of the department/ disciplinary authority/Government. His function is to examine the evidence presented by the Department, even in the absence of the delinquent official to see as to whether the unrebutted evidence is sufficient to hold that the charges are proved. In the present case the aforesaid procedure has not been observed. Since no oral evidence has been examined the documents have not been proved,



and could not have been taken into consideration to conclude that the charges have been proved against the respondents.

29. Apart from the above, by virtue of Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India the departmental enquiry had to be conducted in accordance with the rules of natural justice. It is a basic requirement of the rules of natural justice that an employee be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in any proceedings which may culminate in punishment being imposed on the employee.

30. When a departmental enquiry is conducted against the government servant it cannot be treated as a casual exercise. The enquiry proceedings also cannot be conducted with a closed mind. The inquiry officer has to be wholly unbiased. The rules of natural justice are required to be observed to ensure not only that justice is done but is manifestly seen to be done. The object of rules of natural justice is to ensure that a government servant is treated fairly in proceedings which may culminate in imposition of punishment including dismissal/removal from service.”

22. It is not in dispute that the respondent authorities have produced any witness to prove the charges and even the contents of the FIR made therein. In the case of **Commissioner of Police, Delhi and Others v. Jai Bhagwan [(2011) 6 SCC**



376], the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "*non examination of a complainant during departmental proceeding leads to denial of an opportunity to a government servant of cross-examination would certainly cause prejudice to the right of the delinquent, who shall be deprived from cross-examination.*"

23. Now coming to the enquiry report, there is no finding as to how the Enquiry Officer has come to the conclusion that the charges levelled against the petitioner stands proved. The entire finding of the Enquiry Officer is based upon the FIR and the vigilance report, the content of which has never been proved and admittedly the Vigilance Case No. 22 of 2008 is still pending. The Presenting Officer has accepted the contention of the petitioner that the land in question is Gairmazarua Mallik land as per the survey record and the action of the petitioner to prevent the complainant in filling up the pond was in accordance with law. However, so far the demand of bribe is concerned, it is completely criminal act on which he made no opinion. The opinion of the Presenting Officer was duly accepted but nonetheless the Conducting Officer placing reliance upon the vigilance case, wherein it has come that the petitioner was apprehended while accepting the bribe, has found the charges proved. The procedure adopted by the Enquiry



Officer and his finding based on no evidence has no sanction of law and deprecated in various decisions, including the decisions discussed hereinabove.

24. Coming to the impugned order of dismissal, this Court further finds that there is no discussion of the show-cause explanation of the petitioner, wherein several factual and legal points have been taken by him in order to confront the charges. The disciplinary authority has inflicted the impugned punishment merely accepting the recommendation of the Conducting Officer and taking note of the fact that the petitioner has not taken any further action to verify as to whether there is any Jamabandi in favour of the complainant and if that is so, no action has been taken for cancellation of it; the aforesaid fact has not been brought to the notice of the superior authorities. This finding of the disciplinary authority is not based upon any charges. The memo of charge, contains only imputation that the petitioner was apprehended while accepting the bribe without there being any substantive charge of his act constituting a misconduct and unbecoming of a government servant. The disciplinary authority has allowed himself to be influenced by irrelevant or extraneous consideration and thereby committed a mistake in upholding the guilt of the petitioner. The finding of



the disciplinary authority is based on no evidence.

25. The Hon'ble Apex Court, time without number in various decisions held that although the charges in a departmental proceeding are not required to be proved like a criminal case i.e. beyond all reasonable doubt, but it cannot lose sight of the fact that the Enquiry Officer performs a quasi judicial function, who upon analyzing the documents must arrive at the conclusion that there had been a preponderance of probability to prove the charges on the basis of materials on record. While doing so, he cannot take into consideration any irrelevant fact. He cannot refuse to consider the relevant fact. He cannot shift the burden of proof and reject the relevant testimony of witnesses only on the basis of surmises and conjectures [**vide M.V. Bijlani v. Union of India (2006) 5 SCC 88**)].

26. From the facts as discussed above, is precisely apparent that the departmental proceeding was not in conformity with the prescriptions as provided under Rule 17 of the Rules, 2005 and the petitioner has been deprived from the opportunity to rebut the allegation.

27. In the case of **Kuldeep Singh v. Commissioner of Police and Others [(1999) 2 SCC 10]**, the Hon'ble Supreme



Court held that “*it was obligatory on the part of the disciplinary authority to have considered the evidence on record before reaching a conclusion that the charge against the delinquent stood proved in the departmental proceeding.*”

28. The orders impugned are sufficient to conclude that, except the imputation of petitioner’s apprehension on the charge of having accepted illegal gratification and lodging of the FIR against him, there is no material, whatsoever to support the charges. The findings, in fact, are based on suspicion and perverse. It is this perverse finding which has also been sustained by the appellate authority in Service Appeal No. 27 of 2018. The appellate authority has also failed to take note of any defence raised by the petitioner in his memo of appeal. The perverse finding of the disciplinary authority have merely been reaffirmed in a mechanical manner.

29. For the reasons afore-noted, this Court has left with no option but to set aside the order dated 07.09.2018 as contained in Memo No. 782 (Annexure-26) as well as the order dated 20.02.2020 passed by the Minister-cum-Appellate Authority, Department of Revenue, Government of Bihar (Annexure-28).

30. Now, it would be pertinent to note that the



petitioner has already superannuated way back on 29.02.2020 and thus any remand of the matter to the disciplinary authority afresh would be offering a premium to the negligence of the management/disciplinary authority and condoning the levity with which the departmental enquiry was conducted.

31. In the case of **Vikash Kumar** (supra), the learned Division Bench of this Court, has refused to accede to the request of the learned Advocate General to grant a remand for the purpose of producing valid evidence; in an identical matter where no valid evidence is led at the enquiry proceeding.

32. It would be worthy to note the relevant extract thereof:

“12. From the above extract it is very clear that the High Court under Article 226/227 is entitled to interfere when the finding of fact is based on no evidence. If in every case where no valid evidence is led at the enquiry proceedings, there is a remand made, it would be offering a premium to the negligence of the Management/Disciplinary Authority and condoning the levity with which the departmental enquiry was conducted. It is the Disciplinary Authority who appoints the Enquiry Officer and also the Presenting Officer. We would think that the Presenting Officer would be well versed in the procedures and also be informed of the manner in



which evidence has to be led before the Enquiry Officer to prove the misconduct alleged against the delinquent employee.

13. In disciplinary enquiry proceedings, it is also the trite principle that the standard of proof is preponderance of probability as distinguished from proof beyond reasonable doubt; as would be required in a criminal prosecution. However, if there is no evidence led at the enquiry, there is no question of any preponderance of probability being drawn to find the allegations proved nor can the delinquent be penalized on the basis of peremptory findings without any valid evidence.”

33. The writ petition stands allowed with all consequential benefits to be extended, preferably within three months.

34. Pending I.A.(s), if any, stands disposed of.

35. There shall be no order as to cost(s).

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	20-01-2025
Uploading Date	10-02-2025
Transmission Date	

