

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA  
AGARTALA**

**WP(C) No.447 of 2023**

Sri Jayanta Das

..... Petitioner(s)

**V E R S U S**

The State of Tripura and others

..... Respondent(s)

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. A.K. Pal, Advocate.  
Mr. D.C. Roy, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. M. Debbarma, Addl. G.A.  
Mr. Raju Datta, Advocate.

---

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. APARESH KUMAR SINGH**

**\_O\_R\_D\_E\_R\_**

**31/07/2023**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

Petitioner has on the basis of the seniority list of Sub-Inspector of Police (Un-Armed Branch) Men as on 01.07.2021 (**Annexure-A**) contended that his juniors at Sl. No.181, Sri Biswajit Das, respondent No.10 and Sri Apu Das at Sl. No. 201, respondent No.11 have been promoted to the post of Inspector of Police though petitioner from scheduled caste category is at Sl. No.103 and has an unblemished record. In fact, he was made In-charge Inspector of Police (UB) on temporary basis by order dated 18.05.2021 (**Annexure-B**). Several persons including the private respondents have been promoted on ad-hoc basis to the post of Inspector of Police (Un-Armed Branch) Men vide notification dated 17.08.2022 (**Annexure-C**) though they are junior to him. It appears that at Sl. No.58 of the notification dated 17.08.2022 (**Annexure-C**), the name of one Jayanta Das, Gomati District against SC category also appears but learned counsel for petitioner submits that

he is not the same person. It further appears that the name of Jayanta Das in the SC category appears at Sl. No.160 in the seniority list as on 01.07.2021 (**Annexure-A**). But according to learned counsel for the petitioner, petitioner is not posted in Gomati District but at Manpathar Police Outpost, P.S. Shantirbazar, District-South Tripura. As such, petitioner has been denied promotion and has therefore made a representation on 24.08.2022 (**Annexure-D**) before the respondent No.6, the Director General of Police, PHQ, Agartala, Tripura but his grievances have not been redressed.

Learned counsel for the State submits that instructions have not been furnished but in case the petitioner has made a representation before the competent authority/the Director General of Police, Tripura on these foundational grounds, if so directed, it may be considered by the respondent authorities in accordance with law.

Having considered the submission of learned counsel for the parties, at this stage, without expressing anything on the merits of the case of the petitioner, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority/respondent No.6, the Director General of Police, Government of Tripura, PHQ to take a decision on the claim of the petitioner in accordance with law within a reasonable period i.e. 8 (eight) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order along with a copy of fresh representation enclosing the entire memo of writ petition and its enclosures.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(APARESH KUMAR SINGH), CJ**