CGHC010384252026 2026:CGHC:42921

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 5036 of 2026

1 - Akhand Railway Karmachari Sangh South East Central Railway Bilaspur, Through Its Mahamantri Sanjay Kumar Gupta, S/o Late Indra Prasad Gupta, Aged About 52 Years R/o Jabadapara, New Sarkanda, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur C.G.

PRIYANKA VERMA
Digitally signed by PRIYANKA VERMA
Date: 2026.10.06 12:31:16 +0530

... Petitioner

versus

1 - Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Railways, Rail Bhawan, Raisina Road, New Delhi

2 - Railway Board Through The Principal Executive Director, Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, Raisina Road, New Delhi

3 - The General Manager, South East Central Railway, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur C.G.

4 - South East Central Railway Shramik Union, Through General Secretary, Mr. Manoj Kumar Behera Railway Colony, Shahdol, M. P. Pin 484001

5 - Dakshin Purva Madhya Railway Mazdoor Sangh Through General Secretary, Central Office - Ram Naresh Bhavan, 2426, Tilak Gali, Pahargarhj, New Delhi, 110055

... Respondents

For Petitioner	**:**	Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate
For Respondent/Union of India	**:**	Mr. Ramakant Mishra, DSGI

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

05/10/2026

1. The petitioner, in this Writ Petition, has prayed for the following reliefs:-

> “i. To kindly issue an appropriate writ, order or direction to quash and set aside the communication/instruction dated 08.07.2025 issued by respondent railway board to the extent it provides for allotment of office accommodation to affiliated Trade Unions of recognized Federations, being arbitrary, illegal, ultra virus the applicable statutory provisions and violative of Articles 14 and 226 of the Constitution of India.
>
> ii. To kindly issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly in the nature of Certiorari, quashing the consequential recommendation /order(s) issued in favour of respondent Nos.4 and 5 for allotment of railway office accommodation pursuant to the impugned communication dated 08.07.2025.
>
> iii. In the alternative, if this Hon'ble Court is of the view that office accommodation can be extended to unrecognized Trade Unions by virtue of the Railway Board's policy, issue an appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondent authorities to extend the same benefit to the petitioner Union on the principle of equality and non-discrimination, keeping in view that the petitioner secured 10,819 votes, which is substantially higher than the votes secured by respondent Nos.4 and 5.

> iv. To kindly pass any other order that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including the awarding of costs to the petitioner."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has filed representations/applications before respondents No.2 and 3 on 08.09.2025 and 31.10.2025. However, despite the lapse of about one year, the said representations have not yet been decided. He, therefore, submits that the petitioner has filed the present petition with a limited prayer that the concerned authorities be directed to consider and decide the representations/applications submitted by the petitioner within a stipulated period.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents/Union of India submits that there is no objection to the limited prayer made by the petitioner and as the representations dated 08.09.2025 and 31.10.2025 were submitted way back, the same shall be considered and decided expeditiously.

4. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record, respondents No.2 and 3 are directed to consider and decide the petitioner's representations/applications in accordance with law, preferably within 45 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. The petitioner shall be at liberty to file a fresh representation before the concerned authority and, in turn, the concerned authority shall consider the same and also take into consideration the earlier representations/applications while deciding the matter in accordance

with law within the aforesaid period. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

6. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the present petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Priyanka