

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16112 of 2023

=====

Gopal Singh, S/o Late Ramcharitr Singh, R/o Village - Bishunpur, P.S. -
Kawakol, Dist. - Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Union of India through IG, Central Sector, CRPF, Vibhuti Khand, Near Ram Manohar Lohiya Hospital, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow, U.P.
2. The DIG P, Group Centre, CRPF, Bijnor, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh.
3. DIG P welfare, CRPF, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sudhanshu Shekhar, Advocate Ms. Shashi Priya, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sinha, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 30-06-2026

Learned Advocate for the petitioner seeks permission to make necessary correction in the cause title of respondent no.2.

2. Permission is accorded.

3. Heard Mr. Sudhanshu Shekhar, learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sinha, learned Advocate for the Union of India.

4. The entire case of the petitioner is based upon the materials suggesting discrimination has caused to him in extending the benefit of pension as per CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972, as amended in CCS (Pension) Rules, 1997.



5. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that despite the petitioner having eligibility to get admissible basic pay of Rs.40400/-, he has been denied the same irrespective of the fact the other identically situated persons have been extended the similar basic pay.

6. The entire fact has been brought to the knowledge of the concerned respondents by making a specific contention that some of the constables have been allowed the basic pay, as has been prayed for in the writ petition, but the same has not been considered in right perspective and denied to the petitioner.

7. Learned Advocate for the Union of India referring to the counter affidavit has submitted that the case of the petitioner was duly verified and upon consideration of the record it has been found that the claim of the petitioner seeking parity with Ram Kathin Ram was found incorrect and, as such, the case of the petitioner for stepping up with the Junior Force was not accepted, therefore, no direction could have been passed in favour of the petitioner.

8. Learned Advocate for the petitioner, at this juncture, submits that in the entire writ petition he has not whispered about Ram Kathin Ram and only because of the fact



that in one of the representation the name of Ram Kathin Ram has been mentioned, the case of the petitioner has been compared with only Ram Kathin Ram and conveniently other identically situated persons have been left out knowingly.

9. Having heard the parties and on perusal of the materials, this Court finds substance in the submissions of the learned Advocate for the petitioner to the extent indicated hereinabove that the petitioner has mentioned the name of several other identically situated persons, who have been allowed the basic pay of Rs.40,400/-, but there is neither any deliberation nor denial of the same and, as such, the respondents are under obligation to consider the claim of the petitioner, who seeks parity with those, whose names have been mentioned in the representation dated 16.01.2020 (Annexure-P/3).

10. In view thereof, this Court directs the respondent no.2 to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 16.01.2020 (Aannexure-P/3) and bring to its logical conclusion by explaining the position as to how case of the petitioner is not at par with other similarly situated persons mentioned in the representation dated 16.01.2020 preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.



11. The writ petition stands disposed of with the
aforesaid directions.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	01.07.2026
Transmission Date	NA

