

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 4296 of 2020**

- Ajit Tiwari S/o Shri Daya Shankar Tiwari Aged About 44 Years
R/o Ward No. 24, Shardapara, Camp No. 02, Near Nishad
Sewa Samiti, Bhilai, P. S. Chhavani, Tahsil And District Durg
Chhattisgarh, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Home/police, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Police Station And Post Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh,
2. Deputy Inspector General Of Police (Digp) Chhattisgarh Armed Force (Caf), Police Head Quarter (Phq), Near Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Police Station And Post Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh,
3. Commandant 7th Battalion, Chhattiagarh Armed Force (Caf), Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh,

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Abhishek Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Mrs. Sunita Jain, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****3-11-2020**

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as Constable in the 7th Battalion, Chhattisgarh Armed Force (CAF) Bhilai, District Durg and his duty was

assigned at Airport. On certain allegations, departmental enquiry was conducted against the petitioner and his services were terminated by order dated 15-5-2017 (Annexure P/1). It is further contended that since at the time of suspension, the petitioner was suffering from mental disorder, therefore, he could not file the appeal before the respondent authorities and thereafter, he regained conscious in the year 2020 and filed the appeal before respondent No.2 – Deputy Inspector General of Police and prayer is made that the said appeal may be decided within a stipulated time.

3. Considering the limited prayer that since the appeal is filed before the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Chhattisgarh Armed Force– respondent No.2, respondent No.2 may decide the appeal preferred by the petitioner and while deciding the appeal, he may consider all the documents which might have been filed, according to the petitioner, for condoning the delay., within a further period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. It is made clear that this court has not made any observation about the entitlement and right of the petitioner.
4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge