

In The High Court at Calcutta

Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction

Appellate Side

Judgment (2)
Moumita
Daily list Item No. 11
Court No. 2

**Present :
The Hon'ble Justice Aniruddha Roy**

WPA 18779 of 2025

**Anil Singh
Vs.
The Union of India & Ors.**

**For the Petitioner : Mr. Shambhu Nath Roy
Ms. Munmun Das
Ms. Afreen Parvez
Mr. Subham Rakshit**

**For the Respondents/Union of India: Mr. Siddhartha Bhattacharyya
Mr. Aritra Shankar Roy**

Heard on : 22.09.2025

Judgment on : 22.09.2025

Aniruddha Roy, J.:

1. Mr. Shambhu Nath Roy, learned counsel appears for the petitioner.
2. Mr. Siddhartha Bhattacharyya, learned counsel with Mr. Aritra Shankar Roy, learned counsel appears for the respondents/Union of India.
3. Mr. Shambhu Nath Roy, learned advocate, fairly submits that since the decision for suspension of the petitioner taken by the employer concerned stands recalled/withdrawn/revoked and the petitioner is working, there is

no further question for challenging the decision of suspension by the petitioner. However, the petitioner questions the validity of the disciplinary proceeding.

4. Referring to the prayers made in the writ petition Mr. Siddhartha Bhattacharyya, learned Union Counsel submits that there is no challenge to the disciplinary proceeding in the prayers made in the writ petition.
5. After considering the rival contentions of the parties and on perusal of the case made out in the writ petition and upon reading the prayers made therein, it appears to this Court that **prayers (a) to (e)** to the writ petition are concerned with the suspension of the petitioner and payment of subsistence allowance. The rest are the interim prayers in aid of the main prayers.
6. None of the prayers in the writ petition shows any challenge thrown by the petitioner questioning the maintainability or validity of the disciplinary proceeding.
7. In view of the above, since the order of suspension has already been revoked **Prayer (a) to (e)** in the writ petition stands satisfied.
8. The employer is directed to continue with the pending disciplinary proceeding and come to its logical conclusion by passing a reasoned decision in accordance with law after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner but positively within a period of **four months** from the date

of communication of this order, without granting any unnecessary adjournment.

9. It is made clear that, this court has not gone into the merits of this writ petition.
10. It is also made clear that, this order will have no impact and effect on the disciplinary proceeding which is being conducted by the employer and the employer shall proceed with its independent mind in accordance with law and without being influenced by observations, if any made by this court.
11. The parties shall be at liberty to urge their respective points in the disciplinary proceeding in accordance with law.
12. With the above observations and directions, this writ petition **WPA 18779 of 2025**, stands ***disposed of***, without any order as to costs.

(Aniruddha Roy, J.)