IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (S) No. 507 of 2026

Rajesh Kujur, aged about 37 years, Son of Komal Paskal Kujur @ Kamil Paskal Kujur, resident of Village – Makhai, Marwai, Morwai, P.O. Bishunpur, P.S. Bishunpur, District – Gumla, Jharkhand

....**Petitioner(s)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Director General and Inspector General of Police, Jharkhand, Ranchi, Government of Jharkhand, having its office at Police Headquarters, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. – Dhurwa, District Ranchi- Jharkhand
2. Deputy Inspector General of Police South Chhotanagpur Range, Ranchi, P.O. Sadar, P.S. – Kotwali, District – Ranchi Jharkhand.
3. Superintendent of Police, Simdega, having its office at Simdega, P.O. Simdega, P.S. – Simdega, District- Simdega, Jharkhand

....**Respondent(s)**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Samavesh Bhanj Deo, Advocate
Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Sachin Kumar, AAG-II

02/Dated: 27.10.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioner praying therein for the following reliefs:

> *"a. For issuance of an appropriate writ/s, order/s or direction/s in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the order of dismissal as contained in Memo No. 3215/Go, dated 23.07.2020 (Annexure-2) passed by the Respondent No.3- Superintendent of Police, Simdega.*
> *b. For issuance of an appropriate writ/s, order/s or direction/s in the nature of Certiorari for quashing of appellate order as contained in Memo No. 3777/Go dated 08.11.2021 (Annexure-4) passed by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, South Chhotanagpur Range, Ranchi whereby and whereunder Appellate Authority-Respondent No.2 dismissed the Memo of Appeal filed by the petitioner.*
> *c. For issuance of an appropriate writ/s, order/s or direction/s in the nature of Certiorari for quashing of order as contained in Memo No. 1036/Ra.Ka. dated 22.03.2025 (Annexure-7) issued by Respondent No.3- Superintendent of Police, Simdega, whereby and whereunder rejected the representation of the petitioner dated 28.01.2025 wherein after acquittal of criminal case petitioner requesting for reinstatement in service.*
> *d. Upon quashing of the aforesaid orders for issuance of an appropriate writ/s, order/s or nature of Mandamus direction/s in the commanding upon the respondents to reinstate the petitioner with all consequential benefit as the petitioner has been acquitted vide order dated 30.11.2024 passed in connection with Session Trial No. 141 of 2024 arising out of Simdega Mahila P.S. Case No. 37 of 2016."*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner amongst other grounds has fairly submitted that at least the respondent authorities should have considered the case of the petitioner on quantum of punishment because matrimonial issues are basically civil in nature and if the petitioner will not be reinstated, it will be practically a death sentence for the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that if the petitioner so wishes he may file a revision before the competent authority who may decide the case also on the question of quantum of punishment.

5. Having regard to the above and after going through the documents available on record, especially the order of acquittal, it indicates that a compromise has been held between the petitioner and the complainant who was also the witness in the departmental proceeding, therefore, interest of justice would be sufficed by granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the revisional authority-Director General of Police in view of Rule 853 of Jharkhand Police Manual.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is given liberty to approach the respondent No. 1 as early as possible; the moment the petitioner will approach the respondent No. 1-Director General and Inspector General of Police, Jharkhand, Ranch, he shall verify the records of the case and pass an appropriate order on the question of quantum of punishment.

7. It goes without saying that if any issue of limitation will come on the way, the same shall be considered sympathetically by the concerned respondent.

8. Accordingly, the instant application stands disposed of.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

October, 27th, 2026
Simran/-
Uploaded-30.10.2026