

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 3524 of 2020

.....

Upendra Kumar Singh aged about 42 years, son of late Ramdeo Singh, resident of Road No. 1, L-4, Qr. No. 12, Sidgora, P.O. Agrico, P.S. Sidgora, District-East Singhbhum at Jamshedpur. **Petitioner(s)**

-VERSUS-

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. Director General-cum-I.G. of Police, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi, having its office at Police House near Project Building, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District-Ranchi.
3. Deputy Inspector General of Police, West Singhbhum (Kolhan Range), Chaibasa, P.O. and P.S. Chaibasa, District-West Singhbhum at Chaibasa.
4. Superintendent of Police, Seraikella-Kharsawan, P.O. and P.S-Seraikella, District-Seraikella-Kharsawan.

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

.....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Adv

For the Respondent (s): Mr. Anish Kumar Mishra, A.C. to Sr. S.C.-I

.....

10/21.01.2026

The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioner for the following reliefs:-

a prayer for issuance of an appropriate writ(s)/order(s)/direction(s) commanding upon the respondents to quash the punishment order contained in Memo No. 3559 dated 21.8.2019 passed by the Superintendent of Police, Seraikella-Kharsawan in Departmental Proceeding No. 12/2018 (Anex-2) whereby and whereunder punishment forfeiture of increment of his salary for a period of six months was imposed which is equivalent to One Black Mark to be incorporated in the A.C.R. and also to quash the Appellate Order passed by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, West Singhbhum (Kolhan Range), Chaibasa contained in

Memo No. 1038 dated 21.5.2020(Annexure-5) by which Appeal Petition of the petitioner was dismissed without any cogent reason.

May pass further writ(s)/ order(s)/direction(s) as your Lordships may deem fit and proper for doing conscionable justice to the petitioner.

2. During course of argument, learned counsel has referred another co-employee who has also been departmentally proceeded for the same and similar charges but he has been granted only one censure; as such learned counsel submits that the instant writ application may be disposed of by giving liberty to the petitioner to approach the appellate authority who shall revisit the order.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents does not have any objection.

4. Having regard to the aforesaid submission, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the appellate authority-respondent no.3, within a period of six weeks from today. If any such representation/appeal is preferred before the 3rd respondent within the aforesaid stipulated period, he shall revisit the order and while revisiting by the appellate authority, he should not get prejudiced by his earlier order dated 21.08.2019.

5. Accordingly, the instant writ application stands disposed of.

(Deepak Roshan, J)

21.01.2026

Amardeep/

Uploaded
28.01.2026