

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCC No. 979 of 2018**

1. The State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Agriculture Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh Rajya Krishi Vipnan Board, Telibandha, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Joint Director, Chhattisgarh, Rajya Krishi Vipnan Board, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicants**Versus**

- Krishna Kumar Sahu, S/o Shri Mukund Sahu, aged about 67 years, R/o Rasoda, P.S. Basna, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

---- Non-Applicant

For Applicant No.1/State	:	Ms. Richa Shukla, Deputy Government Advocate.
For Applicant Nos.2 & 3	:	Shri Yashwant Singh Thakur, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant	:	Shri Raghvendra Pradhan, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra****Order on Board****Per Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice****21.02.2019**

1. Heard the counsel for the parties.
2. A departmental enquiry was initiated sometime in the year 2006 against the employee Respondent No.1. Since 2006, nothing came to be done in the departmental enquiry. The Court also took note of this fact, while hearing the appeal that more than 8 years had also elapsed since superannuation of the employee. While deciding his appeal, vide order dated 25.07.2018 ,in the given facts and circumstances, the Court passed the following order:

“In totality, therefore, we direct the Respondents that the departmental proceedings against the Appellant must be

concluded within a period of four months from today. Failure to do so would mean that the charge-sheet issued against him dated 11.09.2006 which is Annexure-P/1 to the writ application and the additional charge-sheet dated 22.03.2007 would be deemed to be quashed.”

3. If, for whatever reasons the Petitioners i.e. the authorities for the State of Chhattisgarh or the Agriculture Marketing Board foresaw or perceived that the time frame so fixed by the Court was not working out for them, the least which could have been done was to file an application before the expiry of the period of 4 months, but that is not so. The petition for extension of time came to be filed only on 26.11.2018 by which date the order had already taken effect.
4. In view of the above, application for extension of time stands rejected.

Sd/-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)
Judge