

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**REVP No. 162 of 2021**

Lilleshwar Dewangan S/o Late Shri J. R. Dewangan Aged About 54 Years
R/o Behind Rajdhani Hospital, In Front Lane Of Mistique Beauty Parlour,
Laxmi Nagar, Pachpedi Naka, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh) Currently
Posted At- Accountant Office Of The Collector, Tribal Development
Section, District Baloda Bazar (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Schedule Caste And
Schedule Tribe Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New
Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Collector Tribal Development Section, Collectorate, District- Raipur
(Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Anuja Sharma, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Jha, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****14/12/2021**

1. Present is a review petition seeking review of the order dated 26.10.2021
passed in WPS 5823/2021.
2. Challenge in the original writ petition was to the charge sheet that was
issued to the petitioner on 16.07.2021. This Court had expressed its
reluctance to entertain the writ petition and not to interfere with the
charge sheet. The grievance of the petitioner is that for want of
necessary details and for want of supply of material documents by the
respondents, he would not be in a position to provide effective reply to
the charge sheet. This Court while disposing of the writ petition had
categorically made an observation that as far as the non availability of
documents and records are concerned, the petitioner would be entitled
for every such record which the department would be relying upon in the

course of departmental enquiry which meets the substantive ground of the petitioner of being provided with necessary documents in support of his contention.

3. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact the petitioner has not been able to submit their reply to the charge sheet as he did not had the material documents available with him. Inadvertently in paragraph 7 of the order the term reply to the charge sheet has been shown to have been filed whereas it was not the reply, It was only a representation. Right of the petitioner to file reply is still open which he has not filed till date.
4. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly taking note of the contents of paragraph 6 of the order against which the review has been filed, this Court is of the opinion that no strong case for review of the order as such has been made out. However, it is clarified that in paragraph 7, where it has been said that petitioner had submitted his reply to the charge sheet on 19.08.2021, it be read as representation having been submitted on 19.08.2021.
5. With the above observations/direction, the review petition stands rejected. Let a copy of this order be made part of the record of the original Writ Petition i.e. WPS 5823/2021.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge