IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(S) No. 3306 of 2025

.....

Santosh Kumar, aged about 53 years, son of Late Babu Ram Saw, resident of Saraidih More, Chhatarpur, P.O.Chhatarpur, P.S. Chhatarpur, District Palamu, Jharkhand. **..... Petitioner(s)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Chief Secretary, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. The Secretary, Department of Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha, Government of Jharkhand having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa P.O. & P.S.Dhurwa, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. The Additional Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
6. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Dhanbad, P.O. Dhanbad, P.S. Dhanbad, District- Dhanbad, Jharkhand. **..... Respondent(s)**

With

W.P.(S) No. 3404 of 2025

.....

Sujit Kumar, aged about 53 years, son of Late Rajendra Prasad, resident of Mansha Ram Ka Akhara, P.O. Patna City, P.S. Mehdiganj, District Patna, Bihar.

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Chief Secretary, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. The Secretary, Department of Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha, Government of Jharkhand having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

3. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa P.O. & P.S.Dhurwa, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. The Additional Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
6. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Dhanbad, P.O. Dhanbad, P.S. Dhanbad, District- Dhanbad, Jharkhand. **..... Respondent(s)**

With

W.P.(S) No. 3423 of 2025

.....

Mihir Kumar, aged about 50 years, son of Sadan Prasad, resident of village Hariharganj, P.O. Hariharganj, P.S. Hariharganj, District Palamu, Jharkhand. **..... Petitioner(s)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Chief Secretary, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. The Secretary, Department of Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha, Government of Jharkhand having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa P.O. & P.S.Dhurwa, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. The Additional Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
6. The Joint Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
7. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Dhanbad, P.O. Dhanbad, P.S. Dhanbad, District- Dhanbad, Jharkhand. **..... Respondent(s)**

With

W.P.(S) No. 3924 of 2025

.....

Sweta Kumari, aged about 54 years, wife of Chitranjan Kumar, resident of 401, Triambak Apartment, Baxi Compound, Near J Sharan Pathology Center, Bariatu, P.O. Bariatu, P.S. Bariatu, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Chief Secretary, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. The Secretary, Department of Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha, Government of Jharkhand having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. The Additional Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Govt. of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
6. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Dhanbad, P.O. Dhanbad, P.S. Dhanbad, District-Dhanbad, Jharkhand.

..... Respondent(s)

.....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

.....

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Adv
Mr. Arpan Mishra, Adv
(in all cases)

For the Respondents: Mr. K. K. Singh, SC-V
[in W.P.S No. 3306 of 2025]
Mr. Kunal Chandra Suman, AC to GP-II
[in W.P.S No. 3423 of 2025]
Mr. Suman Marandi, AC to SC-IV
[in W.P.S No. 3404 of 2025]
Mr. Nawal Kishor Pandey, AC to SC (L&C)-I
[in W.P.S No. 3924 of 2025]

.....

C.A.V. ON: 05/05/2026 **PRONOUNCED ON:10/07/2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Since, common issues are involved in all these writ petitions, they were heard together and are being disposed of by this common order. In all the writ petitions, the respective petitioner has challenged the decision taken to initiate the departmental proceeding against the petitioners and further prayer has been made for setting aside the charge memo and the entire departmental proceedings initiated against the petitioner.

3. PRAYER

In W.P.(S) No. 3306 of 2025

(i)For issuance of an appropriate writ(s) / order(s)/ direction(s) particularly a writ of certiorari for quashing of the Notification as contained in Memo No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-121/2023 1489 dated 02.06.2025(Annexure-9) issued under the signature of Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, whereby and whereunder a decision has been taken to initiate Departmental Proceedings against the petitioner under Rule-17 of the Jharkhand Government Servants (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 2016 on the basis of the Charge Memo and consequently set-aside the entire disciplinary proceedings initiated thereon.

AND

(ii) Further writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) for quashing of the show cause Notice including Charge Memo as contained in Memo No. 9/Arop-Dhanbad-121/2023 2524 dated 01.08.2023 (Annexure-6) issued under the signature of Additional Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand whereby and whereunder the petitioner has been asked to respond to the Charge Memo constituted against the petitioner.

AND

(iii)Further writ(s)/ order(s) / direction (s) upon the respondents to stay the further proceedings in connection with Departmental Proceeding initiated against the petitioner vide Notification as contained in Memo No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-121/2023 1489 dated 02.06.2025.

In W.P.(S) No. 3404 of 2025

(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ(s) / order(s)/ direction(s) particularly a writ of certiorari for quashing of the Notification as contained in Memo No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-120/2023 1488 dated 02.06.2025(Annexure-9) issued under the signature of Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, whereby and whereunder a decision has been taken to initiate Departmental Proceedings against the petitioner under Rule-17 of the Jharkhand Government Servants (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 2016 on the basis

of the Charge Memo and consequently set-aside the entire disciplinary proceedings initiated thereon.

AND

(ii)Further writ(s)/ order(s) / direction(s) for quashing of the show cause Notice including Charge Memo as contained in Memo No. 9/Arop-Dhanbad-120/2023 2532 dated 01.08.2023 (Annexure-6) issued under the signature of Under Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand whereby and whereunder the petitioner has been asked to respond to the Charge Memo constituted against the petitioner.

AND

(iii) Further writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) upon the respondents to stay the further proceedings in connection with Departmental Proceeding initiated against the petitioner vide Notification as contained in Memo No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-120/2023 1488 dated 02.06.2025.

In W.P.(S) No. 3423 of 2025

(i)For issuance of an appropriate writ(s) / order(s)/ direction(s) particularly a writ of certiorari for quashing of the Notification as contained in Memo No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-118/2023 1536 dated 05.06.2025 (Annexure-10) issued under the signature of Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, whereby and whereunder a decision has been taken to initiate Departmental Proceedings against the petitioner under Rule-17 of the Jharkhand Government Servants (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 2016 on the basis of the Charge Memo and -consequently set-aside the entire disciplinary proceedings initiated thereon.

AND

(ii)Further writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) for quashing of the show cause Notice including Charge Memo as contained in letter No. 927 dated 03.04.2025 (Annexure-7) issued under the signature of Joint Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, whereby and whereunder the petitioner has been asked to respond to the Charge Memo constituted against the petitioner.

AND

(iii)Further writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) upon the respondents to stay the further proceedings in connection with Departmental Proceeding initiated against the petitioner vide Notification as contained in Memo No. No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-118/2023 1536 dated 05.06.2025

In W.P.(S) No. 3924 of 2025

(i)For issuance of an appropriate writ(s) / order(s)/ direction(s) particularly a writ of certiorari for quashing of the Notification as contained in Memo No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-119/2023 1490 dated 02.06.2025 (Annexure-8) issued under the signature of Deputy Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, whereby and whereunder a decision has been taken to initiate Departmental Proceedings against the petitioner under

Rule-17 of the Jharkhand Government Servants (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 2016 on the basis of the Charge Memo and -consequently set-aside the entire disciplinary proceedings initiated thereon.

AND

(ii)Further writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) for quashing of the show cause Notice including Charge Memo as contained in letter No. 09/Arop-Dhanbad-119/2023 2537 dated 01.08.2023 (Annexure-5) issued under the signature of Additional Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, whereby and whereunder the petitioner has been asked to respond to the Charge Memo constituted against the petitioner.

AND

(ii)Further writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) upon the respondents to stay the further proceedings in connection with Departmental Proceeding initiated against the petitioner vide Notification as contained in Memo No. No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-119/2023 1490 dated 02.06.2025.

FACTUAL MATRIX OF THE CASE

4. On 07.08.2020, a complaint was purportedly made by one Sri Ramesh Kumar Rahi claiming to be a social worker regarding the irregularities in registration and mutation of land in the Office of The District Sub-Registrar, Dhanbad and various Circle Offices.

5. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms by a letter dated 19.08.2020 directed the Deputy Commissioner, Dhanbad to enquire into the said complaint. The enquiry committee comprising Additional Collector, Dhanbad and two Executive Magistrates submitted the report and show cause notice were issued to the respective petitioner.

6. It was alleged that there was certain mismatch in the old survey khata/plot numbers and the corresponding new survey khata/plot numbers as recorded in the registered sale deeds. Further it was alleged that the documents annexed with the sale deed was not verified from the Registration Office.

7. The respective petitioner had submitted a reply pointing out that the verification of the title and khatiyan/

records of rights are outside the powers and duties of the registering officer under Section 21 of the Registration Act, 1908 (herein after referred to as 'Act') read with Instruction No. 135 of the Bihar Registration Manual and further brought on record the Departmental Letters dated 05.09.2017 and 02.05.2018.

8. The Deputy Commissioner, Dhanbad by a letter dated 18.11.2020 had forwarded the preliminary enquiry report to the department and a second show cause notice was issued to the respective petitioner. The respective petitioner had submitted their reply and ultimately charge memo was issued to the respective petitioner after three/ five years from the date of the original complaint.

9. The gist of the allegations as mentioned in the charge memo of the respective petitioners are set out in the chart herein below:-

Case No.	Charges
W.P(S) No. 3306 of 2025	During the tenure of the petitioner on the post of District Sub-Registrar, Dhanbad, in the 29 registered deeds which were registered in between 2017 to 2019 there was mismatch between the Old Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers and the corresponding New Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers as recorded in those deeds. The petitioner has not verified the documents annexed with the registration deed from the Office of the Circle Officer, Dhanbad.
W.P(S) No. 3404 of 2025	During the tenure of the petitioner on the post of Sub-Registrar, Govindpur, Dhanbad, in the 13 registered deeds which were registered in between 2017 to 2018 there was mismatch between the Old Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers and the corresponding New Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers as recorded in those deeds. The petitioner has not verified the documents annexed with the registration deed from the Office of the Circle Officer, Govindpur, Dhanbad.

W.P(S) No. 3423 of 2025	During the tenure of the petitioner on the post of District Sub-Registrar, Govindpur, Dhanbad, in the 01 registered deed which was registered on 06.03.2020 there was mismatch between the Old Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers and the corresponding New Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers as recorded in those deed. The petitioner has not verified the documents annexed with the registration deed from the Office of the Circle Officer, Govindpur, Dhanbad.
W.P(S) No. 3924 of 2025	During the tenure of the petitioner on the post of District Sub-Registrar, Dhanbad, in the 08 registered deeds which were registered between 2018 to 2019 there was mismatch between the Old Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers and the corresponding New Survey Khata/ Plot Numbers as recorded in those deeds. The petitioner has not verified the documents annexed with the registration deed from the Office of the Circle Officer, Dhanbad.

Thereafter, departmental proceedings were initiated against the respective petitioner under Rule 17 of the Jharkhand Government Servants (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 2016 and the notification of initiation of the departmental proceeding and charge memo are impugned in the respective writ petitions.

The State Government has filed the counter affidavit in the respective writ petition and has admitted the fact that the Registrar has no power to verify the title, but is empowered under section 21 of the Act read with instruction no. 135 of the Bihar Registration Manual to decide whether property is registrable.

ANALYSIS

10. The gist of the allegations against the respective petitioner was that when the respective petitioners were posted as District Sub-Registrar/ Sub-Registrar, at Dhanbad/ Govindpur at the relevant point of time and the charges were that the respective petitioner has not verified the title of the registered deeds produced before them and the charges are similar and same in nature with respect to other charges, as the other charges is with regard to different registered deeds; however the crux of the allegation is that the respective petitioner has not verified all the documents relating to titles and there was certain mismatch in the old survey khata/ plot numbers and corresponding new survey khata/ plot numbers as recorded in the registered deeds.

11. Rule 58 of the Chotanagpur Tenancy Rules, 1959 reads as under:-

> *"58. **Distribution of copies of record-of-rights to parties interested.-***
> *(a) A copy of the record-of-rights as finally published, or an extract therefrom shall be made over to the landlord concerned, or, where there are more landlords than on, to their common agent or common manager, or, it there be no common agent or common manager, to such person among the landlords as the Revenue-officer may think fit. The copy of extract shall bear a certificate, under the Revenue-officer's signature and seal, that it is a copy of or extract from the record-of-rights as finally published.*
> *(b) An extract from the khatian relating to his tenancy shall be given to every tenant under the seal of the Revenue-officer and under the signature of an officer*

duly authorized by the Revenue-officer to give copies.

(c) The cost of the preparation of copies of records, or of extracts therefrom, supplied to landlords and tenants under this rule, shall ordinarily be included in the cost of the survey and settlement, and no separate charge shall be levied from the landlords and tenants in respect of such copies except by the orders of the Local Government.

(d) If the Local Government so directs copies of the maps shall be prepared and distributed to the landlords and tenants concerned. The cost of the preparation of the copies so distributed shall be included in such of the costs of the settlement as are recoverable from the landlords and tenants, and no separate charge shall be levied from them in respect thereof."

12. Thus, the responsibilities for the correctness of survey/ record of rights particulars are statutorily fixed upon the Revenue Officer under Rule 58(b) of the Chotanagpur Tenancy Rules, 1959 and not upon the Registering Authority.

13. However, what is the scope of registering authority has been set out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***K. Gopi versus The Sub-Registrar*** reported in ***(2026) 2 SCC 696***. Paragraphs 18 and 19 of the judgment reads as under:-

"18. The registering officer is not concerned with the title held by the executant. He has no adjudicatory power to decide whether the executant has any title. Even if an executant executes a sale deed or a lease in respect of a land in respect of which he has no title, the registering officer cannot refuse to register the document if all the procedural compliances are made and the necessary stamp duty as well as registration charges/fee are paid. We may note here that under the scheme of the 1908 Act, it is not the function of the Sub-Registrar or Registering Authority to ascertain whether the vendor has title to the property which he is seeking to transfer.

> ***19.*** *Once the registering authority is satisfied that the parties to the document are present before him and the parties admit execution thereof before him, subject to making procedural compliances as narrated above, the document must be registered. The execution and registration of a document have the effect of transferring only those rights, if any, that the executant possesses. If the executant has no right, title, or interest in the property, the registered document cannot effect any transfer."*

14. The legal position after the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***K. Gopi (supra)*** is that the Registering Authority has no adjudicatory power over the executant title, even if the executant has no title, the Registering Authority cannot refuse registration once stamp duty is paid and further ascertaining the vendor's title is simply not the Registrar's function under the Act.

15. Section 21 of the Act reads as under:-

> ***"21.Description of property and maps or plans.—***
>
> *(1) No non-testamentary document relating to immovable property shall be accepted for registration unless it contains a description of such property sufficient to identify the same.*
>
> *(2) Houses in towns shall be described as situate on the north or other side of the street or road (which should be specified) to which they front, and by their existing and former occupancies, and by their numbers if the houses in such street or road are numbered.*
>
> *(3) Other houses and lands shall be described by their name, if any, and as being the territorial division in which they are situate, and by their superficial contents, the roads and other properties on to which they abut, and their existing occupancies, and also, whenever it is practicable, by reference to a Government map or survey.*

> *(4) No non-testamentary document containing a map or plan of any property comprised therein shall be accepted for registration unless it is accompanied by a true copy of the map or plan, or, in case such property is situate in several districts, by such number of true copies of the map or plan as are equal to the number of such districts."*

16. Section 21(1) of the Registration Act, 1908 requires only that a non-testamentary document "contains a description of such property sufficient to identify the same", and sub-sections (2) and (3) merely prescribes the manner in which such description is to be furnished by the party presenting the document by reference to locality, boundaries and, where practicable, government map or survey.

17. The provision casts no duty upon the Registering Officer independently to verify the correctness of the Khata/ Plot number so furnished.

18. Section 21 of the Act requires that the description of the property in the document should be sufficient to identify it. It does not provide for any enquiry at that stage or later by the Registrar.

19. Having set out the above legal position whether the stand of the respondents that Section 21 of the Act is attracted, the State Government has conceded in their counter affidavit at *paragraphs 24 and 26 in W.P(S) No. 3306 of 2025* that a Registering Officer *"does not have the*

power to check the title of property" and that his powers under section 21 of the Act read with Instruction No. 135 of the Bihar Registration Manual is confined to satisfying himself as to the registrability of a document, and not to adjudication of title or verification of the correctness of survey/ record of rights entries.

20. In view of the above provisions, it is very clear that the allegations leveled against the respective petitioner cannot be said to be statutory functions/ duties of the Registrar, hence the allegations do not make out any case of misconduct against the respective petitioner.

21. From records, it appears that pursuant to the original complaint dated 07.08.2020, the enquiry report was submitted on 27.10.2020 and the respective petitioners submitted their explanation in the year 2020; however, the charge memo was issued in the year 2023/2025 i.e. nearly three/five years later and the impugned notification directing for initiation of departmental proceedings under Rule 17 was issued in the year 2025, almost five years after the original complaint and such prolonged inordinate and unexplained delay by the department causes serious prejudice to the respective petitioner.

22. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of

Amresh Shrivastava versus The State of Madhya Pradesh and Ors. reported in ***2025 SCC OnLine SC 693*** has held at paragraph 16 and 17 as under:-

> ***"16.*** *In the present case, we are of the considered view that the charges alleged against the Appellant in the chargesheet fall under the category of a wrongful order, which does not appear to have been influenced by extraneous factors or any form of gratification. It appears that the order has been passed in good faith, without any indication of dishonesty. Furthermore, the facts outlined in the Show Cause Notice do not suggest any such impropriety. The power exercised by the Appellant in his capacity as a Tehsildar, while passing the order of Land Settlement Order, cannot be considered of a nature that would warrant disciplinary proceedings against him. The decision relied upon by the Counsel for the Appellant as mentioned above, supports this view. Consequently, the first question is answered in favor of the Appellant.*
>
> ***17.*** *As to the second question, regarding whether delay is a ground for stopping the departmental proceedings at the stage of the chargesheet itself, suffice it to say that this varies from case to case. However, in the instant case where there is unexplained inordinate delay in initiating departmental proceedings despite the alleged misconduct being within the knowledge of the department, but still no departmental proceedings are initiated, the answer must go in favour of the employee."*

23. In the case of ***Amresh Shrivastava (supra),*** the Hon'ble Apex Court has interfered with the allegation in the show cause notice and chargesheet which reflected that the settlement order passed by the *quasi-judicial* authority was wrong with no suggestion of *bribery, mala-fide*, ulterior motive or recklessness.

24. In these cases, there is no allegation against the respective petitioner which indicates recklessness, undue favour, corrupt motive, misconduct or extraneous

influence. There is no allegation, much less any finding, of pecuniary gain, collusion or *mala-fide* against the respective petitioner.

25. In view of the aforesaid facts, law and the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court of India, the following order is passed: -

i) Notification No. 09/Arop(Dhanbad)-121/2023 1489 dated 02.06.2025 annexed as Annexure-9 and Charge Memo as contained in Memo No. 9/Arop-Dhanbad-121/2524 dated 01.08.2023 annexed as Annexure-6 in W.P(S) No. 3306 of 2025, are hereby, quashed and set-aside.

ii) Notification No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-120/2023 1488 dated 02.06.2025 annexed as Annexure-9 and Charge Memo as contained in Memo No. 9/Arop-Dhanbad-120/2023 2532 dated 01.08.2023 annexed as Annexure-6 in W.P(S) No. 3404 of 2025, are hereby, quashed and set-aside.

iii) Notification No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-118/2023 1536 dated 05.06.2025 annexed as Annexure-10 and Charge Memo as contained in Letter No. 927 dated 03.04.2025 annexed as

Annexure-7 in W.P(S) No. 3423 of 2025, are hereby, quashed and set-aside.

iv) Notification No. 09/Arop (Dhanbad)-119/2023 1490 dated 02.06.2025 annexed as Annexure-8 and Charge Memo as contained in Letter No. 09/Arop-Dhanbad-119/2023 2537 dated 01.08.2023 annexed as Annexure-5 in W.P(S) No. 3924 of 2025, are hereby, quashed and set-aside.

26. Accordingly, all these writ applications stand allowed. Pending I.A.(s), if any, stands closed.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

Dated:10 /07/2026
Amardeep/
A.F.R

Uploaded on
10.07.2026