

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

**CLAIM PETITION NO. 69/SB/2021**

Smt. Sangeeta Nautiyal, w/o Sri Vineet Bhadulla, aged about 36 years, presently posted as Sub-Inspector, State Women Commission, District Dehradun.

**.....Petitioner**

**VS.**

1. State of Uttarakhand through Secretary, Home, Civil Secretariat, Dehradun.
2. Additional Director General of Police (Admin), Uttarakhand.
3. Inspector General of Police, Garhwal, Uttarakhand.
4. Senior Superintendent of Police, Dehradun, Uttarakhand.
5. Sri Madan Pal Saini, the then S.H.O., Clement Town, Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

**.....Respondents.**

*(virtually)*  
Present: Sri Shashank Pandey, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Sri V.P.Devrani, A.P.O., for State Respondents.

**JUDGMENT**

**DATED: MARCH 14, 2024**

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

Punishment order dated 18.09.2019 (Annexure: A 1) passed by the disciplinary authority, whereby petitioner was awarded 'censure entry' and appellate order dated 29.10.2020 (Annexure: A 2) passed by the appellate authority, are under challenge in present claim petition.

2. Sri Shashank Pandey, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner drew attention of the Tribunal towards grounds '5- (a to f)', taken in the petition, to

submit that the petitioner wants to file revision against the impugned orders to highlight these points before the revisional authority, therefore, liberty may be granted to the petitioner to file statutory revision. The Tribunal need not reproduce those grounds, for, they are already part of record.

3. In reply, Ld. A.P.O. submitted that permission of the Tribunal is not required for filing statutory revision. Petitioner can do it on her own. It is her entitlement.

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 her by the Tribunal, inasmuch as, to file revision is her entitlement.

7. The claim petition thus stands disposed of with the consent of Ld. Counsel for the parties, leaving it open to the petitioner to file statutory revision under Rule 23 of the Rules of 1991, as prayed for by Ld. Counsel for the petitioner. 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: MARCH 14, 2024.*  
*DEHRADUN*

*VM*