

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 355 of 2015

Jai Kumar Singh

.....

Petitioner

Vrs.

- 1.The State of Jharkhand
- 2.The Inspector General of Police (Training),
Government of Jharkhand , Ranchi
- 3.The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Singhbhum (Kolhan)
Region, Chaibasa, West Singhbhum
- 4.The Senior Superintendent of Police East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur

..... Respondents

.....
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH

For the Petitioner : M/s Ritu Kumar, Samavesh Bhanj Deo

For the Respondents : Mr. Mohan Kr. Dubey, J.C to A.G.

04/26.10.2015 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner was imposed with punishment of forfeiture of one increment for a period of 1 month only, which would not have effect on his future pay revision and he would be entitled to subsistence allowance only for the period of his suspension, though the said period would be adjusted against his admissible half pay leave. The punishment imposed by the Senior Superintendent of Police, East Singhbhum, Jamshedpur on the charges of failing to deliver the 'daak' at the prescribed office i.e. in the Officer In-charge, Olidih O.P. vide impugned District order no. 268/11 bearing no. 7548 dated 31.0.2010, Annexure-7 has also been confirmed in appeal by the impugned order bearing memo no. 555 dated 10.5.2013(Annexure-8) issued by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Singhbhum(Kolhan)Region, Chaibasa, respondent no.3.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has made an effort to show that the punishment is not justified in view of the findings of the enquiry.

Learned counsel for the respondent- State has opposed the prayer and responded by filing counter affidavit as well.

Upon perusal of the relevant material documents including the impugned orders, it appears that only one increment for a

period of one month has been withheld, which would also not have any effect on his future pay revision, based upon the opinion arrived at in the enquiry by the Enquiry Officer that he failed to deposit 'daak' at the concerned office. In exercise of powers of judicial review, this Court does not find any sustainable grounds of facts or law to interfere in such an order.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(Aparesh Kumar Singh, J.)

A. Mohanty