

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3074 of 2017

=====

Mukesh Kumar Son of Sri Rabal Chandra, Resident of Village- Salowal, P.O.
P.S.- Taragarh, District- Pathankot Punjab.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi
2. The Union Home Secretary, Government of India, New Delhi.
3. The Union Secretary, Personnel and Grievance Cell, Government of India, New Delhi.
4. The Director, General of Central Industrial Security, Force Headquarter, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road
5. The Inspector General, Central Industrial Security Force, Eastern Zone, Patna Bihar.
6. The Deputy Inspector General of Central Industrial Security Force, East Zone, Patna Bihar.
7. The Group Commandant, Central Industrial Security Force, Patna Bihar.
8. The Deputy Commandant, Central Industrial Security Force, Indian Oil Refinery Corporation, Barauni,

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy, Advocate
For the UOI	:	Mr. Satyabir Bharti, Sr. CGC
		Mr. Alok Kumar, CGC
		Ms. Kanupriya, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

4 20-03-2025 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and Learned
Senior Counsel for Union of India.

2. The present writ petition has been filed challenging
the orders of Original Authority as well as Appellate Authority.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for Union of India raised
preliminary objection and submits that the petitioner was
enrolled member of the force namely, Central Industrial Security
Force which is guided by the law namely, Central Industrial



Security Force Act, 1968 (Act No.50 of 1968) (hereinafter referred to as 'Act of 1968'). Counsel further submits that section 9(1) of the Act of 1968 deals with the provision of statutory appeal within 30 days from the date on which the order passed under Section 8 is communicated to the enrolled member of the force by way of filing appeal. Counsel further submits that as per section 9(2-A) of the Act of 1968, any enrolled member of the force aggrieved by an order passed in appeal under Section 9(1) of the Act of 1968 may, prefer a revision petition against the order of such authority within a period of six months from the date on which the order is communicated to him. Here in the present case, admittedly, the petitioner has failed to exhaust the remedy available to him under law under Section 9(2-A) of the Act of 1968.

4. In this view of the matter, this writ petition is hereby disposed off granting liberty to the petitioner to avail the remedy of revision under Section 9(2-A) of the Act of 1968. It is made clear that the delay if any, in filing the revision shall be condoned by the authority concerned.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

