

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Appeal No. 295 of 2015**

Laddoo Thakur, aged about 59 years, S/o Late Raghunandan R/o village and Post Rajnagar, Tahsil Kotma, District Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh.

**---- Appellant****Versus**

1. South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. through its chairman cum Managing Director, Seepat Road, Bilaspur.
2. Chief General Manager (Mines) Rajnagar, R.O. Sub Area, Hasdeo Area, Colliery District Anuppur.
3. Assistant Manager (Personnel) Hasdeo Area Colliery, South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. P.O Rajnagar Colliery District Anuppur.

**---- Respondents**


---

For Appellant : Shri Parag Kotecha, Advocate.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice**  
**Hon'ble Shri Prashant Kumar Mishra, J.**

**Judgment on Board****Per Navin Sinha, Chief Justice****15/05/2015**

1. The present appeal arises from order dated 31.3.2015 dismissing Writ Petition (S) No. 839 of 2015 challenging the issuance of charge-sheet to the Appellant on 25.7.2012.
2. Learned Counsel for the Appellant submits that the charge-sheet is highly belated. It has been issued just prior to his scheduled superannuation in 2016. The Respondents have had more than enough time to hold departmental proceedings.
3. The allegations in the charge-sheet relate to obtaining of employment by impersonation which is a very serious charge. The contention of delay urged on behalf of the Appellant, is a relative term in departmental proceedings dependent upon the nature and gravity of the charge. There is no absolute

proposition that a departmental proceedings ought not to be allowed merely on the ground of delay. A charge of fraud can be investigated at any time. Delay has no relevance. Even otherwise, as held in (2006) 12 SCC 28 (Union of India v. Kunisetty Satyanarayana) a writ petition will not lie against a charge-sheet which may or may not culminate in an order of punishment or exoneration.

4. The appeal is dismissed.

5. Before we part with the file, it is considered necessary to notice that Rule 58(1) Proviso of the High Court of Chhattisgarh Rules, 2007 provides that the pages of a petition have to be numbered serially. If additional pleadings are filed during hearing, the serial page number on the additional pleading is required to be in continuation of the pages mentioned in the original table of contents of the paper book. There is no provision in the High Court Rules for re-numbering the brief after its disposal starting with the cover page of the file and serial numbering of the index, synopsis as distinct from the commencement of the cause title.

6. According to the present practice, the office scores out the paging given by the Counsel at the time of filing and re-numbers the brief commencing from the cover page. It is creating a lot of confusion in Court when the Counsel refers correctly to the page number according to the original brief while the office has given a new page number to the same page. This practice is required to be stopped forthwith.

7. The Registrar General shall ensure that the paging of all briefs and pleadings in an application are done serially and in continuation. It shall remain so even after the case is disposed.

8. The Registrar General shall ensure strict implementation of this order.

Sd/-  
(Navin Sinha)  
**CHIEF JUSTICE**

Sd/-  
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)  
**JUDGE**