

**BEFORE THE UTTARAKHAND PUBLIC SERVICES TRIBUNAL  
AT DEHRADUN**

**CLAIM PETITION NO. 07/SB/2024**

Sunil Kumar Constable, age 35 years, s/o Sri Dharam Lal Bhilangwal, r/o Kewli, District Rudraprayag, presently posted in Police Line Roshnabad, Haridwar .

**.....Petitioner**

**vs.**

1. The State of Uttarakhand through Secretary, (Home), Govt. of Uttarakhand, Dehradun.
2. Director General, Uttarakhand Police, Dehradun.
3. Addl. Director General Uttarakhand Police, Dehradun.
4. Inspector General of Police, Uttarakhand, Garhwal Region, Dehradun.
5. Deputy Inspector General of Police, Uttarakhand, Garhwal Region, Dehradun
6. Senior Superintendent of Police, District Haridwar, Uttarakhand.

**.....Respondents**

Present: Sri Uttam Singh, Advocate, for the Petitioner.  
Sri V.P.Devrani, A.P.O., for the Respondents.

**JUDGMENT**

**DATED: JANUARY 25, 2024**

**Justice U.C.Dhyani (Oral)**

By means of present claim petition, petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

- “i) To set aside the punishment order dated 20.04.2022 vide which the respondent disciplinary authority has reduced the petitioner to the lower

stage/ pay scale for a period of one year, which is a major punishment (Annexure: A-1).

ii) To set aside the order dated 25.07.2023 *vide* which the respondent appellate authority has rejected the appeal of the petitioner (Annexure: A-2).

iii) To direct the respondent to regularize the suspension period in duty and pay the salary for the said period.

iv) Any other relief the Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit in the circumstances of the case

iii) Award the cost of the petition to the petitioner.”

*[Emphasis supplied]*

2. At the very outset, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner drew attention of the Bench towards paragraphs 4.07 to 4.10, 4.12, 4.22-4.23, 4.32, 4.36, 4.44-4.48, 4.5-4.51, 4.56-4.58 & 4.6 of the claim petition to submit that the petitioner wants to highlight the facts and grounds taken by him in claim petition before the revisional authority, therefore, the petitioner may be given liberty to file the revision against the impugned orders, before the revisional authority. In reply, Ld. A.P.O. submitted that permission of the Tribunal is not required for filing statutory revision. Petitioner can do it on his own.

3. Ld. Counsel for the parties submitted that such an order can be passed by Single Bench of the Tribunal.

4. Rule 23 of the Uttar Pradesh Police Officers of Subordinate Ranks (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1991 (for short, 1991 Rules), as applicable to State of Uttarakhand, reads as below:

“**23. Revision-**(1) An officer whose appeal has rejected by any authority subordinate to the Government is entitled to submit an application for revision to the authority next in rank above by which his appeal has been rejected within the period of three months form the date rejection of appeal . on such an application the power of revision may be exercised only when in consequent of flagrant irregularity , there appears to have been material injustice or miscarriage of justice.

.....

.....

(2) .....

*[Emphasis supplied]*

5. In this context, it will be apt to reproduce order dated 24.12.2021 passed by Hon'ble High Court in WPSS No. 1451 of 2021, hereinbelow for convenience:

“As would be apparent from the scrutinization of the impugned orders, which are challenged by the petitioner in the present writ petition.

The order of punishment has been imposed upon the petitioner by the respondents authority, while exercising their powers under Uttar Pradesh Police Officers and Subordinate Rank, Rules, 1991, which has been made applicable, even after the enforcement of the Uttarakhand Police Act, 2007.

As a consequence of the set of allegations of misconduct levelled against the petitioner, by virtue of the impugned order, which has been passed while exercising the powers under Section 23 (1) (d) of the Uttarakhand Police Act, 2007, the petitioner was placed under the lowest in the cadre for a period of one year. As against the principal order of punishment passed by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, on 20.02.2021, the petitioner preferred an appeal under the Rules of 1991, which too has been dismissed.

Under the Rules of 1991, if any person is aggrieved by an appellate order, imposing the punishment for the misconduct, provided under the Rules, a provision of revision has been contemplated under Rule 23 of the Rules.

Hence, this writ petition is dismissed with the liberty left open for the petitioner to approach before the next superior authority, to the appellate authority to file a revision under Rule 23 of the Rules of 1991.”

6. The petitioner, therefore, has statutory remedy to file revision under Rule 23 of the Rules of 1991, which opportunity cannot be denied to him by the Tribunal, inasmuch as, to file revision is his entitlement.

7. The claim petition thus stands disposed of, leaving it open to the petitioner to file statutory revision under Rule 23 of the Rules of 1991, as prayed for by him. Delay in filing the same is condoned in the interest of justice. No order as to costs.

8. Rival contentions are left open.

**(JUSTICE U.C.DHYANI)**  
CHAIRMAN

*DATE: JANUARY 25, 2024.*  
*DEHRADUN*

VM