IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

L.P.A. No. 465 of 2025

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi.
2. Principal Secretary, Personnel, Administrative Reforms & Rajbhasha Department, Government of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi.
3. The Joint Secretary, Personnel, Administrative Reforms & Rajbhasha Department, Government of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi.

... Appellants

Versus

1. Rabindra Nath Panda, son of Late Ram Krishna Panda, resident of Rani Bagan, Bariatu, P.O. & P.S. Bariatu, District Ranchi.
2. Shri A.K. Sinha, father's name not known to the appellants, the then Conducting Officer -cum- Departmental Enquiry Officer, Government of Jharkhand, Town Administrative Building, Heavy Engineering Corporation, Gol Chakkar, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ PRASAD

For the Appellants: Mr Rahul Kamlesh, A.C. to S.C.-IV
For Resp. No. 1: Mr Ashim Kumar Sahani, Advocate
Ms Manjulika Hora, Advocate
Mr Harshit Jain, Advocate

03/Dated: 26.10.2026

1. Heard Mr Rahul Kamlesh, learned A.C. to S.C.-IV for the appellants; and Mr Ashim Kumar Sahani, learned counsel, for the 1st respondent, along with Ms Manjulika Hora, learned counsel for the 1st respondent.

2. I.A. No. 10756 of 2025 seeks condonation of delay of 53 days in instituting the accompanying appeal.

3. We have perused the averments in the I.A. and we are satisfied that sufficient cause has been shown. Even otherwise, the delay is also not inordinate.

4. Accordingly, we condone the delay and dispose of I.A. No. 10756 of 2025.

5. With consent, this appeal is taken up for hearing.

6. This appeal is directed against the learned Single Judge's order dated 06.03.2025, disposing of W.P.(S) No. 5304 of 2018 and quashing the order dated 19.09.2018 imposing a punishment of deduction of 10% of pension on the 1st respondent herein.

7. Mr Rahul Kamlesh submitted that, in this case, oral evidence was unnecessary because there was no specific denial by the 1st respondent of the charges levelled against him during the disciplinary proceedings. He further submitted that the charges against the 1st respondent were proved on the basis of documentary evidence.

8. Mr Sahani defended the impugned order on the basis of the reasoning set out therein. He submitted that the appellants made no admission of guilt and that no oral evidence was led in this matter. He further submitted that this case was covered by the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Roop Singh Negi Vs. Punjab National Bank & Ors., (2009) 2 SCC 570,*** and ***Satyendra Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3325.***

9. We have considered the rival contentions, perused the record and reasoning in the impugned order. We are satisfied that this is not a matter warranting the reversal of the impugned order.

10. Contentions about admission of guilt cannot be accepted, given the record in this matter. Even then, the dispute was not a matter that could have been proved merely based on some documents. Admittedly, in this matter, the appellants led no oral or documentary evidence.

11. In any event, in ***Roop Singh Negi (supra) and Satyendra Singh (supra)***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that guilt could not be established by relying solely on a document relating to an irregular transaction. Since no witnesses were examined to prove the document or otherwise establish the charge against the delinquent employee, the Hon'ble Supreme Court interfered with the penalty imposed, holding that the penalty was imposed in breach of mandatory procedure and the principles of natural justice and fair play.

12. In this case, the appellants did not even bother to prove the charges against the 1st respondent by producing any credible documents. Even if they had produced such documents, the facts of the present case would not establish the charges against the 1st respondent, given the defence raised by the respondent in this matter.

13. Since the respondent's case was slightly on better footing than the appellants' case in the above-referred decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the learned Single Judge was justified in following the reasoning therein and passing the impugned order quashing the penalty of deduction of 10% of the pension payable to the original petitioner. We find no error, much less

any perversity in the view taken by the learned Single Judge while passing the impugned order.

14. Recently, in **R. Saravanan v. Periyar University, 2026 INSC 1136,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the Letters Patent Bench can interfere with the Single Judge's judgment only where the findings are demonstrably erroneous and the mistake is glaring on the face of the record.

15. For the reasons stated above, we dismiss this appeal without any order as to costs.

16. Pending Interlocutory Applications, if any, do not survive and are disposed of.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Manoj Prasad, J.)

October 26, 2026

N.A.F.R.

APK/VK

Uploaded on 28.10.2026