

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.28 of 2025**

=====

Shashi Shekhar Thakur son of Late Ram dev Thakur, Resident of Bhup Narayan Singh Colony Ward No. 21, P.S.-Madhubani, District-Madhubani, Bihar-847211.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Sardar Patel Bhawan, Bailey Road, Rajbansi Nagar, Patna, Bihar.
3. The Director General of Police, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, 6-Circular Road, Rajbansi Nagar, Patna, Bihar.
4. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Shahabad Range, Dehri, Bihar-821305.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Buxar, Bihar-802101.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                                            |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Adv.<br>Mr. Suraj Prakash, Adv.<br>Ms. Nisha Suman, Adv. |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. K.P. Gupta, Government Pleader (10)<br>Mr. Virendra Kumar, AC to GP.10 |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      10-01-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as  
  
counsel for the respondent -State.

2. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has joined the services in the year of 1985 and after completion of 10 years and 20 years subsequently, he got his first and second MACP, he completed his 30 years of services on 14.10.2015 and according to the relevant rules he is entitled to get the third MACP but, till date no MACP has been granted in favour of the petitioner and for the same he has continuously represented before the respondent authorities but



no decision has been taken by the respondents/competent authorities till date. Therefore, it is prayed by the counsel that the respondents/competent authorities be directed to consider and decide the claim of petitioner and pass a reasoned order on the representation submitted by the petitioner i.e. P-11 (last one) dated 16.04.2024.

3. The above limited prayer made by the counsel for petitioner is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents. He submit that if this Court directs then the representation of the petitioner will be decided by the competent authority within eight weeks.

4. On the basis of statements put forth by both the counsels, the petition is disposed of directing the respondents/competent authorities to consider and decide the pending application of the petitioner probably within eight weeks in accordance with relevant rules and laws and pass a reasoned order.

5. With the aforesaid observation, this petition is disposed of.

**(Arvind Singh Chandel , J)**

Siddharth Soni/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

