

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**REVP No. 55 of 2017***(Arising out of judgment/order dated 17.1.2017 in Writ Petition (PIL) No.85 of 2016 of the learned Division Bench)*

T. Radhakrishnan IAS (Retd.) S/o Late C.Thankappan, Aged About 60 Years, R/o A-2, Swaroop Nagar, Near Silver Oak Public School, Burari Road New Delhi 110042

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Union Of India Through Its Secretary, Department Of Personnel And Training, Ministry Of Personnel, Public Grievances And Pensions, North Block, New Delhi 110001
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur 492002
3. The Chief Secretary, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh 492002
4. The Secretary, Chhattisgarh State Economic Offences Bureau, In Front Of Jai Jawan Of Petrol Pump, Telibanda Road, Raipur 492001, Chhattisgarh
5. Shri Raj Kumar Mishra S/o Late Ganesh Prasad Mishra, R/o Haldibadi, Chirmiri, Police Station Chirmiri, Khadgaon Tahsil, Koriya District Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri B.D. Guru, Advocate.
For State	: Shri J.K. Gilda, Advocate General with Shri R.K. Gupta, Deputy Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Sanjay Agrawal, Judge.

Order on Board**Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice****31/01/2018**

1. This application seeking review of judgment is by T. Radhakrishnan, a retired IAS officer about whom certain references are made in paragraph-6 of the judgment/order, which is sought to be reviewed.
2. Hearing the learned counsel for the review Petitioner and the learned Advocate General as well as the learned Assistant Solicitor General, we see that the

apprehension sounded down by the review Petitioner is about the conduct that is attributed to him through the second internal paragraph of paragraph-6 of the judgment/order, which is sought to be reviewed. While the review Petitioner is under the impression that it contains a criticism that he had not been participating in the inquiry, we are inclined to take the view that what is stated in the internal paragraph-2 of paragraph-6 of the judgment/order is only the expression made during the course of formulating the conclusions of the judgment. It does not cast aspersion or amount to adverse remark against the review Petitioner. All that has been said is that if the inquiry gets further dragged down and if such delay in the inquiry is attributable to the conduct of the review Petitioner, Shri T. Radhakrishnan, the inquiry officer will be substituted and the inquiry will be got conducted through Justice Shri Dharendra Kumar Mishra, former Judge of the High Court. The contents of the paragraph-6 of the order which is sought to be reviewed clearly shows that there is no adverse remark regarding the conduct of the review Petitioner so as to inculcate him, on that premise, during the inquiry proceedings.

3. With this clarification, this review petition is ordered.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(Sanjay Agrawal)
JUDGE