

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA  
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION  
APPELLATE SIDE

**WPA 9812 of 2026**

Santa Kumar Chowdhury  
-versus  
Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Shyamal Sarkar, Sr. Advocate  
Mr. Rajesh Gupta  
Mr. Kanishk Kumar  
... For the petitioner

Mr. Subhankar Chakraborty  
Ms. Sayani Gupta  
Mr. Atindra Rai  
... For UOI

Mr. Manik Das (vc)  
... For the Eastern Coalfields Limited

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.

2. The petitioner is serving as the General Manager of a colliery in Kajora area of Eastern Coalfields Limited. A disciplinary proceeding has been initiated against him. Being aggrieved by the initiation of the disciplinary proceeding, the petitioner approached this Court in an earlier occasion by filing a writ petition, being WPA 29741 of 2025, which stood disposed of on 19<sup>th</sup> January, 2026.

3. The Court was not inclined to interfere with the charge sheet and the enquiry proceeding. The Court granted leave to the petitioner to raise the issue of non-supply of relevant documents while giving reply to the enquiry report which will be furnished to the petitioner if finding of the enquiry report is adverse to his interest.

4. The Court was pleased to extend the time to file the defense statement.

5. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the defense statement has already been filed and the enquiry report furnished to the petitioner. Copy of the measurement book and other documents sought for by the petitioner have, however, not been supplied.

6. It has been submitted that on a perusal of the documents sought for by the petitioner, it will be evident that the entire charges against the petitioner are misdirected and preconceived. It has been further submitted that the petitioner did not challenge the enquiry report in the earlier writ petition. The same has been challenged in the present writ petition. Issuance of the enquiry report is a fresh cause of action.

7. Prayer has been made to set aside the entire disciplinary proceeding including the enquiry report.

8. The aforesaid submission and prayer of the petitioner is opposed by the learned advocate representing the respondents. It has been submitted that the petitioner has not yet filed reply to the enquiry report. It has been contended that the petitioner may make necessary submission at the time of filing the reply to the enquiry report.

9. Upon hearing the submissions made on behalf of both the parties, it appears that the prayer of the petitioner for interfering with the charge sheet and the enquiry proceeding was not accepted by the Court in the earlier occasion when the petitioner filed the earlier

writ petition. The said order has attained finality. The prayer of the petitioner seeking direction upon the authority for grant of documents cannot be re-agitated all over again. The enquiry report has already been supplied to the petitioner.

10. It will be open for the petitioner to raise all issues including non-supply of relevant documents as allowed by the Court on 19<sup>th</sup> January, 2026.

11. If a prayer is made by the petitioner for supply of documents, the same shall be considered by the authority in line with the earlier order of the Court.

12. The writ petition stands disposed of.

13. All parties shall act on the basis of a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

14. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

**(Amrita Sinha, J.)**