Serial No. 01
Supplementary List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WA No.6/2026

Date of order: 24.02.2026

Rakesh Chopra ..... Appellant

Vs.

1. Union of India, through Secretary, Ministry of Defence, Border Road Wing, South Block, New Delhi – 110011.

2. Union of India, through its Secretary, Department of Personnel & Training Ministry of Personnel, PG and Pensions, North Block, New Delhi – 110011.

3. Central Vigilance Commission, through Secretary, Satarkta Bhawan, Block-A, GPO Complex, INA, New Delhi – 23.

4. Joint Secretary Border Road, Department of Defence, Ministry of Defence, Border Road Wing, South Block, New Delhi – 110011.

5. Lt. Gen. Raghu Srinivasan, the Director General Border Roads (DGBR), Border Road Organisation, Seema Sadak Bhawan, Ring Road, Delhi Cantt., New Delhi – 110010 (since retired).

6. Lt. Gen. (Retd.) Rajeev Chodhary, (Former) DGBR, through Border Road Organisation, Seema Sadak Bhawan, Ring Road, Delhi Cantt., New Delhi – 110010.

7. The Chief Engineer, Project Beacon, Old Air Field, Budgam, Rangreth, Srinagar, Jammu & Kashmir – 190007.

8. The Chief Engineer, HQ Research & Development Estt. (BRO), near William Carey University, Nongmynsong, Shillong, Meghalaya – 793019. ..... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Revati Mohite Dere, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

For the Appellant : Mr. N.K. Gupta, Adv with
Ms. M. Surong, Adv

For the Respondents : Dr. N. Mozika, DSGI with
Ms. R. Fancon, Adv

i)	Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc.:	Yes/No
ii)	Whether approved for publication in press:	Yes/No

JUDGMENT: (per the Hon'ble, the Chief Justice) (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned Deputy Solicitor General for the respondents.

2. By this appeal, the appellant has impugned the judgment and order dated 24th November, 2025, passed by the learned Single Judge in WP (C) No.374 of 2025.

3. The grievance of the learned counsel for the appellant is that although the learned Single Judge had quashed the chargesheet dated 22nd April, 2025 issued by the respondents to the appellant, the learned Single Judge had not granted the second prayer of the appellant which sought for a direction to the respondent to stop any further acts of victimisation/harassment

or obstruction against the appellant, including but not limited to, blocking his promotion prospects or making any negative entries in the service records on the basis of the chargesheet.

4. We have perused the impugned judgment and order dated 24th November, 2025. Paragraph 13 of the said judgment reads thus:

> "*13. Accordingly, in view of the discussions made hereinabove, the impugned chargesheet dated 22-04-2025 and Corrigendum dated 05-08-2025, being visited by incurable defects, the same are hereby set aside and quashed leaving the respondents to take any further action strictly in accordance with law.*"

5. It is thus evident from the aforesaid, that the chargesheet was quashed due to technical defects which were incurable leaving the respondents to take any action, however, strictly in accordance with law.

6. Learned DSGI states that the respondents are bound to comply with the said direction i.e. they will act strictly in accordance with law.

7. In view of the statement made by the learned DSGI, learned counsel for the appellant does not press this appeal. The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

(W. Diengdoh)
Judge

(Revati Mohite Dere)
Chief Justice

Meghalaya
24.02.2026
"Lam DR-PS"

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by
LAMPHRANG KHARCHANDY
Date: 2026.02.24 17:10:28 IST