

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 1330 OF 2017

Ramji Lal Verma S/o Rambharoes, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Angad Colony, Ward No.5, Near New Water Tank, Sawda, Post Sawda, District Datiya (M.P.)

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Directorate General, Central Industrial Security Force, Block No. 13, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Raod, New Delhi.
2. The Deputy Inspector General, Central Industrial Security Force, Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai Nagar, Durg, District Durg (C.G.)
3. The Commandant, Central Industrial Security Force, Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai Nagar, Durg, District Durg (C.G.)
4. The Enquiry Officer/Dy. Commandant, Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai Nagar, Durg, District Durg (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Kunal Das, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. R.K. Kesharwani, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

20/03/2017

1. Challenge in the present writ petition is to the order dated 15.4.2015 whereby the authorities have refused to entertain the representation of the Petitioner for reconsideration of order dated 6.11.2015 which is the rejection order of the mercy petition preferred by the Petitioner.
2. This Court at the outset is not inclined to entertain the present writ petition, on the simple ground that the petition suffers from inordinate delay and laches. The authorities concerned have rightly rejected the application holding it to be filed at a belated stage.
3. The Petitioner in the instant case was terminated from services on 27.9.1994. Subsequently, at the interference by the High Court vide its order dated 4.5.2007 passed in Writ Petition No. 3746 of 1995, the authorities concerned had set aside the order of termination and has taken him back in employment treating the intervening period to be as dies non. The Petitioner immediately came in employment and after 8 years time he preferred a

department appeal for the first time on 10.11.2014 which was rejected holding it to be time barred on 12.12.2014. Against the said rejection of appeal, he preferred a revision before the Director General and the said revision also was rejected on 15.4.2015, holding the revision also to be time barred. It was thereafter that the mercy petition was preferred on 29.10.2015 which now stands rejected vide impugned order dated 6.11.2015.

4. The very fact that there is no proper, cogent and satisfactory explanation given by the Petitioner for the inordinate delay of preferring an appeal against the order of *dies non* after reinstatement in services, this Court does not find it to be a good case for interference with the impugned order of rejection of mercy petition.

5. The present writ petition thus being devoid of merits the same is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE