

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

**Claim Petition No. 82/SB/2023**

Prashant Rana (Constable), aged about 41 years, s/o Sohan Rana, r/o  
village Basunga, PS Kotwali, District Uttarkashi, Uttarakhand-249193.

.....Petitioner

versus

1. State of Uttarakhand, through Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Dehradun.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Uttarkashi.
3. The Inspector General of Police (Garhwal Region), Uttarakhand.

..... Respondents

Present: Sri Abdul Hameed, Advocate, for the petitioner  
Sri V.P. Devrani, Advocate, for respondents

**Judgement**

**Dated: 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2023**

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

By means of present claim petition, the petitioner seeks to set aside the impugned order dated 15.02.2020 (Annexure: A1), which has been affirmed by the Appellate Authority *vide* order dated 18.05.2020 (Annexure: A2).

2. Petitioner was awarded 'censure entry' by the disciplinary authority (S.P., Uttarkashi), which has been upheld by I.G., Garhwal Range, in departmental appeal.

3. Aggrieved with the same, present claim petition has been filed by the petitioner.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner sought parity with judgement rendered by this Tribunal on 02.01.2023 in Claim Petition No. 38/SB/2020, Deepak Chaudhary vs. State of Uttarakhand and others. Relevant paras of such judgment read as under:

“ .....

6. Learned Counsel for the petitioner drew attention of this Tribunal towards sub-section (2) of Section 86 of the Uttarakhand Police Act, 2007, to submit that “Rules or Regulations made under the provisions of the said Act (*i.e. The Indian Police Act, 1861*) shall, insofar as it is not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act be deemed to have been made under the corresponding provisions of the Act and shall continue to be in force unless and until superseded by anything done or action taken under this Act.”

7. Sri V.P. Devrani, learned A.P.O., submitted that there is no provision of revision under the Uttarakhand Police Act, 2007.

8. In reply, learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the U.P. Police Officers of the Subordinate Ranks (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1991, have been framed under the Indian Police Act, 1861. No rules or regulations have, so far been framed under the Uttarakhand Police Act, 2007, and therefore, the remedy of revision is available to the petitioner inasmuch as it is not inconsistent with the provisions of Uttarakhand Police Act, 2007 and therefore, revision will lie.

9. Without prejudice to rival contentions, the claim petition is disposed of by giving liberty to the petitioner to submit an application for revision to the Authority next in rank above by which his appeal has been rejected, within four weeks from today. The delay in filing such application is condoned in the interest of justice [Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 applies to the applications also].

10. If such revision is filed by the petitioner, within the aforesaid period, the competent authority shall decide the same without unreasonable delay, in accordance with law. No order as to costs.”

5. Learned Counsel for the petitioner confined his prayer to the extent that present claim petition be decided in the light of the judgement rendered by this Tribunal on 02.01.2023 in Claim Petition No. 38/SB/2020, Deepak Chaudhary vs. State of Uttarakhand and others.

6. In reply, learned A.P.O. submitted that as per Rule 23 of the U.P. Police Officers of the Subordinate Ranks (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1991 (as applicable to the State of Uttarakhand), the revision

should have been filed within 90 days from the date of rejection of the appellate order, therefore, revision would be time barred.

7. Considering the peculiar facts of the case, present claim petition may be disposed of, at the admission stage, in terms of the decision rendered by this Tribunal on 02.01.2023 in Claim Petition No. 38/SB/2020, Deepak Chaudhary vs. State of Uttarakhand and others by condoning the delay (under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963).

8. Without prejudice to rival contentions, the claim petition is disposed of by giving liberty to the petitioner to submit an application for revision to the Authority next in rank above by which his appeal has been rejected, within 8 weeks from today. Since Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, applies to the applications also, therefore, the delay in filing such application is condoned in the interest of justice.

9. If such revision is filed by the petitioner, within the aforesaid period, the competent authority may decide the same, in accordance with law, without unreasonable delay. No order as to costs.

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

*DATE: 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2023*

*DEHRADUN*

*RS*