IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P(S). No. 705 of 2020

Arun Kumar Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o Late Rameshwar Singh, Resident of Fatehpur, P.O& P.S-Fatehpur, District-Jamtara

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Principal Secretary, Food, Public Distribution and Consumer Affairs Departments, Government of Jharkhand, at Project Building, P.O& P.S-Dhurwa, District Ranchi **.....Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioners : Mr. Amit Kr. Verma, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. Rahul Saboo, GP-II
: Mr. Abhilash Kumar, A.C to GP-II
: Mr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Advocate
: Mr. Sharon Toppo, Advocate

08/ Dated: 04.05.2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is having no instructions from his client, as such he is unable to press this writ application.

2. However, looking to the prayer made in this writ application and the nature of punishment, this Court proceeds to decide this case on merit.

3. The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioner, praying therein for quashing of Memo No. 2494 dated 20.08.2019 (Annexure-9), issued under the Signature of Under Secretary, Food, Public Distribution and Consumer Affairs Department, Government of Jharkhand; whereby and whereunder after culmination of departmental proceedings, the petitioner was awarded punishment of stoppage of enhancement of salary with cumulative effect and warning for future misconduct.

Further prayer has been made to discharge petitioner from all liabilities in connection with the departmental proceeding held against the petitioner for no lifting of foods for distribution.

4. After going through the impugned order, it is clear that the punishment is of awarding stoppage of one increment, for one year, with non-cumulative effect which is certainly a minor punishment and a warning was also issued (Annexure-9).

5. It has been contended by the learned counsel for the respective respondents that since it is a minor punishment; as such, there is no procedural error, accordingly, no interference is required and perhaps, due to this reason, the petitioner has lost interest in this case.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, and after going through the impugned order (Annexure-9), it appears that the same is a well-reasoned order and since neither there is any procedural error; nor there is perversity in the order, accordingly, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order of punishment.

7. As such, this writ application stands dismissed.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

Abha/-

04.05.2026