

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12053 of 2025

=====

Ravindra Kumar Son of Suresh Sharma, Resident of Chhoti Kako, P.S.-Kako,
District-Jehanabad, Pin Code - 804418.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The DIG of Police, Champaran Range, Bettiah.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Bagha.
5. The Central Selection Board (Constable Selection) through its Chairman, Bihar, Patna.
6. Special Works Officer, Central Selection Board (Constable Selection), Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ram Hriday Prasad, Adv. Mr. Kumar Mangalam, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. AC to Standing Counsel (24)
For the C.S.B.C	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Adv. Mr. Binod Kumar Mishra, Adv. Mr. Vivek Anand Amritesh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL
ORAL ORDER

2 20-08-2025 Heard learned counsels appearing for both the parties.

2. This petition has been preferred by the petitioner seeking following reliefs:

“That this is an application for issuance of appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondents for payment of arrear of salary and annual increment to the petitioner for the period of dismissal from 30.05.2017 to 05.07.2024 and for grant of all consequential benefits.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially the petitioner was appointed on the post of constable in the district of Bagha. Subsequently, on the basis of certain allegations departmental enquiry has been initiated against him and he was punished vide order dated 30.05.2017, Annexure – P/3, against the said order appeal has been filed by the petitioner which has also been dismissed. However, order of punishment has been challenged by the petitioner bearing CWJC no. 2096 of 2018 which has been disposed of by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide its Order dated 01.07.2024, Annexure – P/9 on the ground of non-appointment of presenting officer. In the light of the said order the petitioner has been reinstated for the purpose of fresh departmental proceeding. Though he was reinstated but, was put under suspension w.e.f. 06.07.2024, after a fresh departmental enquiry the enquiry officer exonerated the petitioner from the charges levelled against him. The report of the enquiry officer has been accepted by the disciplinary authority and finally vide order dated 06.02.2025, Annexure – P/11 suspension of the petitioner has been revoked. Since, in the departmental enquiry petitioner has been exonerated from the charges levelled against him therefore, he is entitled to get entire salary as well as other benefits which has not been provided to him. The petitioner raising all his grievances already made a representation before the respondents vide Annexure – P/12 dated 30.03.2025 but, the representation made by the petitioner has not been decided yet.



4. Counsel for the respondent-State prays for some time to file para wise counter affidavit.

5. Considering the submissions made by both the counsels, I am of the view that this petition can be disposed of directing the concerned respondent i.e. respondent no. 4 to consider and decide the pending representation of the petitioner Annexure P-12 dated 30.03.2025 within any specific period fixed by this court. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that petitioner may be permitted to give a fresh representation raising all grounds which he raised in this writ petition. The prayer made by the counsel is allowed. In turn, respondent no. 4 is also directed to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in accordance with relevant rules and laws as early as possible and pass a reasoned order probably within 60 days from the filing of the representation of the petitioner.

6. With the aforesaid observation, this writ petition is disposed of.

(Arvind Singh Chandel , J)

Siddharth Soni/-

U			
---	--	--	--

