

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 5213 of 2018**

D.K. Nagwanshi S/o Ghanshyam Nagwanshi Aged About 49 Years  
Sub Engineer, Posted In Office Executive Engineer , Public Works  
Department , Mungeli Division, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Chief Secretary, Public Works Department , Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh. Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Superintending Engineer (Enquiry Officer) Public Works Department , Setu Nirman Mandal, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**----Respondents**

|                |   |                                         |
|----------------|---|-----------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Mr. C.K. Sahu, Advocate                 |
| For State      | : | Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy****Order on Board****14/08/2018**

1. The limited grievance which the petitioner has sought in the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondents to conclude the departmental enquiry pending against the petitioner within a stipulated period.
2. According to the petitioner, the charge sheet was issued in the year 2011 and the respondents had initiated a disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner in the year 2014 and though 4 ½ years have passed, the respondents have till date not concluded the inquiry and that the petitioner also in the meanwhile has been denied promotion on account of the pendency of the departmental enquiry. He submits that an appropriate direction be issued to the respondents ensuring that the departmental enquiry is concluded at the earliest.

3. The said limited prayer of the petitioner is not opposed by the State counsel.
4. Given the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also taking note of the entire factual matrix, particularly the fact that the departmental enquiry had been initiated against the petitioner about 7-8 years back, this Court is of the opinion that the prayer sought for by the petitioner is justified as the petitioner cannot be made to face the trauma of being castigated as an employee, who is subjected to enquiry and the enquiry for no fault of the petitioner is getting prolonged.
5. Given the facts, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to ensure that the departmental enquiry initiated against the petitioner is concluded at the earliest within an outer limit of 6 months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the order of this Court and the petitioner shall also render full cooperation for the early conclusion of the enquiry.
6. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to appraise the Inquiry Officer so far as the directions given by this Court.
7. The writ petition accordingly allowed and disposed off.

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