

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(S). No. 5286 of 2023

(Naveen Kumar Verma & Ors. Vs. State of Jharkhand & Ors.)

CORAM : HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE S.N. PATHAK

For the Petitioners : Mr. Diwakar Upadhyay, Advocate

For the Respondents : Ms. Divya, AC to SC-III

06/ 25.06.2024 Heard the parties.

2. Petitioners are Driver Constable, who were adjusted as Driver (Constable) after passing the required examination.
3. It is the specific case of the petitioners that since they were fulfilling the requirement for adjustment against the post of Driver (Constable), their names were recommended for adjustment vide Annexures-2 and 3 to the writ petition and finally vide Force Order No. 658/2021 dated 06.08.2021(Annexure-4), the same was approved.
4. It is being argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that one fine morning the Inspector General of Police, who had earlier recommended the names of petitioners, had recalled his order on the ground that since no rule is there for adjustment, some Rule needs to be framed and thereafter, the adjustment can be done as per the Rules.
5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that since their adjustment was in absence of any rule the same was kept in abeyance as new Rule was yet to be framed.
6. This Court fails to understand as to when petitioners were fulfilling the requisite qualification and they were adjusted, how come the Inspector General of Police, who had earlier passed the order of adjustment, had recalled the order in anticipation of the Rules which is yet to be come.

7. Let the respondents file a specific affidavit within a period of two weeks stating therein as to under which provision of law, the same has been kept in abeyance/ stayed. The respondents are further directed to state as to whether Inspector General of Police was empowered to review his own order.
8. List this case on 22.07.2024

(Dr. S. N. Pathak, J.)

kunal