CGHC010408332026 2026:CGHC:44987

NAFR

SOURABH BHILWAR
Digitally signed by SOURABH BHILWAR
Date: 2026.10.27 12:06:06 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7631 of 2026

Vinod Vishwakarma S/o Shri J.R. Vishwakarma Aged About 45 Years Occupation - (Suspended) Assistant Sub-Inspector (Ministerial), Third Vahini C.S.B.L., Amleshwar Durg, District - Durg (C.G). R/o- E-73 Indraprast Phase-Ii, Raipura, Thana D.D. Nagar, District Raipur (C.G)

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Home, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office And Police Station Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G)

2 - Under Secretary, Department Of Home, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office And Police Station Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Director General Of Police, Police Headquarters, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur (C.G)

4 - Inspector General Of Police, Crime Investigation Department, Police Headquarters, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur, (C.G.)

5 - Deputy Inspector General, C.G. Shastara Bal, 19 Pokhran Vahini, Jagdalpur, District Bastar (C.G.)

6 - Chandrashekhar Tiwari Working As Steno At Office Of Superintend Of Police (Gramin) Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.).

7 - Vijay Tirkey Working As Assistant Commander At Third Vahini C.S.B.L., Amleshwar Durg, District - Durg (C.G).

8 - Arvind Kujur (Retired From The Post Of DIG, Madhya Range), Through The Chhattisgarh Armed Force Madhya Range PHQ, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.).

... Respondents

(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ishan Verma, Advocate alongwith Mr. Virendra Kashyap, Advocate
For Respondents/ State	:	Mr. Suyashdhar Badgaiya, Govt. Advocate

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE BIBHU DATTA GURU)

Order on Board

26/10/2026

1. By the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks quashment of the impugned orders dated 26.05.2026 and 19.06.2026 (Annexures P/1 and P/2, respectively), whereby the Inquiry Officer appointed to inquire into the complaints lodged by the petitioner against certain officers was changed and a fresh inquiry was ordered to be conducted by another Inquiry Officer.

2. (a) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an officer of the Chhattisgarh Armed Force, who joined the Third Battalion, Amleshwar, Durg, in the year 2009 and has discharged his duties with sincerity and dedication. He submits that the petitioner lodged complaints dated 12.02.2025 and 12.02.2026 against certain officers alleging financial

irregularities, pursuant to which an inquiry was initiated vide order dated 12.03.2026 and an Inquiry Officer was appointed. It is submitted that the Inquiry Officer recorded the petitioner's statement, examined 12 witnesses and collected relevant documents and evidence in connection with the allegations.

(b) Learned counsel further submits that, while the inquiry was nearing completion, upon an application submitted by the officers against whom allegations had been made, the respondent authorities, vide impugned order dated 26.05.2026 (Annexure P/1), changed the Inquiry Officer without any allegation of bias or misconduct against the earlier Inquiry Officer. Subsequently, vide order dated 19.06.2026, another Inquiry Officer was appointed to conduct the inquiry afresh. Learned counsel further submits that, thereafter, the petitioner was placed under suspension vide order dated 20.08.2026 on the allegation of obtaining Government records without permission, which, according to him, was intended to victimise him for raising complaints against the said officers. He, therefore, challenges the impugned orders as arbitrary and illegal.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the writ petition and submits that the impugned orders have been passed by the competent authority in the administrative interest. It is submitted that the change of Inquiry Officer and the subsequent suspension of the petitioner were effected in accordance with the extant rules and procedure. Therefore, no interference by this Court is warranted.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.

5. Bare perusal of the record would show that the petitioner has challenged the orders dated 26.05.2026 and 19.06.2026, whereby the Inquiry Officer was changed and another Inquiry Officer was appointed to conduct the inquiry afresh into the complaints lodged by the petitioner. It is well settled that the conduct of an inquiry and the appointment or change of an Inquiry Officer fall within the administrative domain of the competent authority. Mere change of the Inquiry Officer, in the absence of any demonstrated violation of statutory provisions or prejudice to the petitioner, does not warrant interference by this Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction.

6. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the impugned orders have been passed in violation of any statutory provision or that the change of the Inquiry Officer has caused any legally sustainable prejudice to him. The allegations of *mala fides* and victimisation, being unsupported by sufficient material on record, do not furnish any ground for interference.

7. As far as the role of the petitioner, being the complainant in an internal inquiry, is concerned, once a complaint is lodged against an officer, it is for the competent authority to conduct the inquiry in accordance with the applicable rules and procedure. The complainant cannot dictate or interfere with the procedure of the internal enquiry conducted by the department. Thus, this Court finds that the petitioner has failed to establish any valid ground to challenge the impugned orders.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby **dismissed** at the motion stage itself.

Sd/-
(BIBHU DATTA GURU)
JUDGE

$. Bhilwar