

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

WP(S) No.1463 of 2021

Bandana Kumari, wife of Vikash Kumar, resident of Qr. No. A/7/D, CISF Colony, Banjhedih, PO Banjhedih, PS Jainagar, District Koderma, Jharkhand

... Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affair, Government of India, officiating at North Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affair, Government of India, officiating at North Block, Central Secretariat, New Delhi, P.O, P.S+ Dist:- New Delhi

3. The Director General of C.I.S.F, officiating at Block No-13, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, P.O+ P.S+ Dist:- New Delhi.

4. The Inspector General of C.I.S.F, Eastern Sector Ranchi, Government of India, officiating at Tiril, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S.- Dhurwa, Dist:-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

5. The Deputy Inspector General of C.I.S.F, East Zone Head Quarter Patna, Government of India, officiating at Boring Road, P.O.- Patliputra, P.S.- Patliputra, Dist:-Patna, Bihar.

6. The Commandant, officiating at C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, P.O.- Banjhedih, P.S.- Jainagar, Dist- Koderma, Jharkhand.

7. Mr. Neeraj Kumar, aged not known, Son of Ganesh Prasad Chaudhary, presently working as Deputy Commandant, C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, P.O.- Banjhedih, P.S.- Jainagar, Dist- Koderma, Jharkhand.

8. Mr. Arvind Kumar, aged not known, Son of not known, presently working as Assistant Commandant, C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, P.O. Banjhedih, P.S. Jainagar, Dist-Koderma, Jharkhand.

9. Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, aged not known, Son of not known, presently working as Ins/Exe, C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, P.O.- Banjhedih, P.S.- Jainagar, Dist- Koderma, Jharkhand.

10. Mr. Yogendra Singh, aged not known, Son of not known, presently working as ASI/Exe, C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, P.O.- Banjhedih, P.S.- Jainagar, Dist- Koderma, Jharkhand.

11. Mr. Sakhtar Singh, aged not known, Son of not known, presently working as Head Constable /GD, C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, P.O.- Banjhedih, P.S. Jainagar, Dist- Koderma, Jharkhand.

... Respondent(s).

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Arun Kumar Dubey, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Anil Kumar, ASGI

Ms. Nitu Sinha, CGC

.....

10 /29.10.2025: Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioner has made the following prayers:

(i) For an issuance of an appropriate writ preferably in the nature of certiorari to set aside / quash the order dated 04.07.2020, passed by the Deputy Commandant of C.I.S.F Unit KTPS Koderma, Banjhedih, vide letter No. V-15014/ Keausub / KTPS / Anu. / Chetawani / 2020-3414, whereby and where-under punishment of Warning has been given to the petitioner by way of passing the order by the aforesaid authority in his own cause.

And/or

(ii) For an issuance of an appropriate writ(s) commanding and directing upon the respondents concerned to initiate criminal or departmental action against the erring officers for having raid / search of the house of the petitioner without getting the permission and / or without obtaining search warrant of the house of the petitioner from the competent authority by fabricating false evidence.

3. The petitioner feeling aggrieved by the order as contained in Memo No. 3414 dated 04.07.2020 passed by the Deputy Commandant of CISF Unit KTPS Koderma, Banjhedih has approached this Court.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that infact the petitioner was harassed by the higher officials for which the petitioner made a complaint. Without properly appreciating the aforesaid fact and without punishing the real culprits, the petitioner was issued the aforesaid letter which caused prejudice to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the Union of India submits that order which the petitioner is challenging is not an order of punishment nor any departmental proceeding was initiated against the petitioner and this order will have no adverse effect on the petitioner or in the career of the petitioner.

6. Heard the parties and have gone through the impugned order which is at Annexure-8 to the writ petition. From the impugned order, I find that it is a communication whereby the

higher authorities has given a warning to the petitioner. Admittedly this is not a punishment, as no departmental proceeding was initiated against the petitioner. Further as per the submission of the learned counsel for the Union of India, this warning will have no adverse effect upon the service career of the petitioner.

7. Thus, from the aforesaid fact it is clear that the petitioner cannot be said to be aggrieved by the warning as contained in letter dated 04.07.2020 as the same will not have any adverse effect upon him.

8. So far as the second prayer of initiating a proceeding against the alleged erring officials is concerned, exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India this Court cannot give direction as sought for by the petitioner.

9. This writ petition is misconceived, thus, the same is **dismissed**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

29.10.2025

Tanuj/CP-2