

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 3788 of 2018**

Abhi S/o Govindo Aged About 57 Years Presently Working As B.M.C. Category-V, At R-6 Old Mines, N.C.P.H. Colliery, Chirimiri, R/o Ward No.15 Hiragir Dafai, Haldibadi, Chirimiri, District Korea Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. Through: its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. General Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Ltd., Malviya Nagar, West Chirimiri Colliery, District Korea Chhattisgarh.
3. Sub/Deputy Area Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Ltd., N.C.P.H. Colliery, Chirimiri District Korea Chhattisgarh.
4. Deputy Chief Personnel Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Ltd., N.C.P.H. Colliery, District Korea Chhattisgarh.
5. Superintendent Of Police, Ganjam District Chattarpur (Odisha)
6. IIC Purushottampur, PS Gangam, District Chattarpur (Odisha).

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Waquar Naiyer, Advocate
For Respondents-SECL	:	Mr. Chandradeep Prasad, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Vaibhav Shukla, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****18/05/2018**

1. Challenge in the present writ petition is to the charge-sheet dated 25.02.2018.
2. Contention of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner is that the department is proceeding with the departmental enquiry in a haste and it is in contravention to the basic principles of natural justice. According to the Petitioner, he is not being provided with all the documents, the statements, which the Respondents are relying upon during the course of inquiry and there is a possibility that the

Petitioner would be punished without sufficient opportunity of defence.

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submits that he has a right to be proceeded in the departmental enquiry where the Enquiry Officer proceeds in a fair and reasonable manner granting full opportunity to the Petitioner. He submits that the Respondents are duty bound to comply with the guidelines or parameters in the course of conducting of departmental enquiry, as as has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of “***The State of Punjab v. Bhagat Ram, 1975 (1) SCC 155.***”
4. Per contra, learned Counsel for the Respondents however submits that they have in fact provided the Petitioner with all the relevant documents which the department is relying upon to establish their case before the Enquiry Officer. Counsel for the Respondents also referred to the documents enclosed with the charge-sheet and the list of documents enclosed with the present writ petition which according to him have been provided to the Petitioner.
5. Given the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, since charge levelled against the Petitioner is of obtaining employment by playing fraud with the management, the management has every right to proceed departmentally against the Petitioner. This Court in exercise of its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India would not come in the way of the department in the course of conducting an enquiry. However, it is expected that the Enquiry Officer shall act fairly and reasonably as is expected from an Enquiry Officer and which has also been stated by the Hon'ble Supreme

Court in the case of **Bhagat Ram** (supra) where in paragraph 7 it was held as under:

“The meaning of a reasonable opportunity of showing cause against the action proposed to be taken is that the Government servant is afforded a reasonable opportunity to defend himself against charges on which inquiry is held. The Government servant should be given an opportunity to deny his guilt and establish his innocence. He can do so when he is told what the charges against him are. He can do so by cross examining the witnesses produced against him. The object of supplying statements is that the Government servant will be able to refer to the previous statements of the witnesses proposed to be examined against the Government servant. Unless the statements are given to the Government servant he will not be able to have an effective and useful cross-examination.”

6. It is expected that the aforesaid observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court shall be borne in mind by the Enquiry Officer as also by the Presenting Officer in the course of enquiry.
7. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge