

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 4936 of 2021**

1. Smt. Annu Giri W/o Neeraj Giri Aged About 36 Years R/o Housing Board Colony, MIG 37, Janjgir Tehsil Champa, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Level, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Nava Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The District And Session Judge Janjgir Champa District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh
3. The Administrative Officer District And Session Court Janjgir Champa District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. K. P. S. Gandhi, Advocate.
For State	:	Ms. Akanksha Jain, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****16.09.2021**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the decision of the respondents whereby they have declined to consider the case of the petitioner for promotion in the light of the disciplinary proceedings pending against the petitioner.
2. According to the counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner in the instant case working on the post of Assistant Grade-III was placed under

suspension for some act of misconduct on 05.02.2019 contemplating departmental enquiry. Subsequently, the petitioner was also issued with a departmental charge-sheet on 25.02.2019 but till date the departmental enquiry has not been concluded. Meanwhile, the services of the petitioner continued under suspension and the petitioner had to file a writ petition i.e. WP(S) No. 1726 of 2020 against the prolonged suspension. The writ petition was finally disposed of on 23.02.2021 directing the respondents to reconsider the claim of the petitioner as regards the suspension part is concerned.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the direction given by this Court, the respondents have reconsidered the case of the petitioner and have revoked the order of suspension and the petitioner has been permitted to resume her duty. Meanwhile, the claim of the petitioner that she had sought for, has been rejected on the ground of pending departmental enquiry.
4. Today, counsel for the petitioner submits that there is yet another departmental enquiry pending against the petitioner of the year 2017 also.
5. Be that as it may, taking into consideration the entire factual matrix of the case particularly taking note of the fact that the two disciplinary proceedings initiated against the petitioner are pending since more than 2 to 4 years and therefore ends of justice would meet, if the writ petition at this juncture is disposed of directing the respondents No. 2 & 3 to ensure that the both the disciplinary proceedings pending against the petitioner is taken up on priority basis and is concluded at the

earliest preferably within a period of 6 months starting from today. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to apprise the respondents No. 2 & 3 so far as the order passed by this Court is concerned.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-

P. Sam Koshy
Judge

J/-