

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR  
RAJASTHAN  
BENCH AT JAI PUR.

O R D E R

S. B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 6139/2010.

Mohammad Rafi k

Versus

State of Rajasthan & Ors.

Date of Order: -

April 30, 2010.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD RAFI Q

Shri Abdul Kalam Khan for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

BY THE COURT: -

Learned counsel submits that petitioner while being a Sub Inspector was placed under suspension vide order dt. 14/2/2008 (Ann. 2) on account of criminal case being registered for offences punishable under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Learned counsel further submits that after the challan was filed in the Court, charges have yet to be framed and the trial may take its own course while he is facing agony of suspension for more than two years.

Learned counsel further submits that without examining the continuation of suspension as to whether it is required or not, the authorities are blindly invoking the circular of the State Government dt. 10th August, 2001 while deciding representation/review of suspension submitted by the employee under Rule 13(5) of the Rajasthan Civil Services (CCA) Rules, 1958.

Learned counsel has further placed reliance on a judgment of this Court reported in **Prem Prakash Mathur Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors** (2005(9) RDD 3962 (Raj.) & **Vishnu Kr. Gupta Vs. State** (2009 WLC (UC) 701). Learned counsel submits that the Circular issued by the State Government dt. 10/08/2001 will not supersede the statutory requirement which is to be complied with by the authority under Rule 13(5) of the Rules.

Without going into merits of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of with the directions to the petitioner to make a fresh representation for review/reconsideration of the orders of suspension dt. 14/2/2008 (Ann. 2) before the competent authority under Rule 13(5) of the Rules, 1958 who may independently examine the same without being influenced by the instructions dated 10th August, 2001 and may also take note of the judgment (supra) and pass speaking order within three months thereafter and decision may be communicated to the petitioner who if still feels aggrieved, will be free to avail the remedy under law.

(MOHAMMAD RAFIQ), J.

ani I