

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 2959 OF 2018**

- Sandeep Chaurasiya, S/o Shri S.K. Chaurasiya, aged about 28 years, posted as Constable, CISF, R/o Masjid Line, Post-Churcha Colliery, District Koriya (Baikunthpur) (C.G.)

**... Petitioner****versus**

1. Union of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi.
2. The Director General, Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), Headquarter, 13 CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-3.
3. The Inspector General, CISF South Sector, Head Quarter, CHPT Campus, Chennai-09.
4. The Deputy Inspector General, CISF, South Zonal Headquarter, D-Skandh, Rajaji Bhawan, Vesant Nagar, Chennai-90.
5. The Group Commandant, Goup Headquarter, CISF, Nisa, Post-Hakimpet, Hyderabad-78.
6. The Deputy Commandant, CISF, Unit, IG Mint, Hyderabad.
7. The Senior Commandant, CISF Unit FACT Udyogmandal, Ernakulam, Kerala.

**... Respondents**

|                 |   |                                |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For Petitioner  | : | Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate. |
| For Respondents | : | Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate. |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**  
**Order on Board**

**12/04/2018**

1. Grievance of the Petitioner is that the Petitioner was initially dismissed from services on 8.10.2015 against which he had preferred a departmental appeal which also stood dismissed on 29.1.2016. Against the rejection of the departmental appeal, the Petitioner preferred a revision petition before Respondent No.3 who partly allowed the revision petition of the Petitioner by setting aside the order of dismissal and reinstated the Petitioner in services. However, the intervening period was ordered to be treated as 'dies non'. The Petitioner was also granted the liberty to make a fresh representation to Respondent No.2 in case, if he is still dissatisfied with the order passed by Respondent No.3, within a period of 15 days. The Petitioner had made an application within 15 days to Respondent No.2 on 23.12.2016 vide Annexure P-4, however the said representation has till date not been decided.

2. The solitary relief which the Petitioner has sought for in this writ petition is for a direction to Respondent No.2 to consider and decide the said representation which is pending before it since December, 2016.
3. The said prayer of the Petitioner is not opposed by the Counsel for the Respondents.
4. This Court was apprehending of its jurisdictional power to entertain the present writ petition. However, the Counsel for the Petitioner candidly made a statement before this Court that the Petitioner has since been transferred and posted in Chhattisgarh, which compels this Court to proceed and decide the matter.
5. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to Respondent No.2 to ensure that the pending representation of the Petitioner be considered at the earliest and decide the same particularly in respect of the order of treating the intervening period as 'dies non', as early as possible, preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt/production of certified copy of this order.
6. With the aforesaid direction/observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-  
**(P. Sam Koshy)**  
Judge