CGHC010425462026 2026:CGHC:46227

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7760 of 2026

Anil Kumar Navrange S/o Shri Mangal Das Navrange Aged About 36 Years R/o Village - Khairjhiti, Post - Ghotwani, Janpad Panchayat Dhamdha Tahsil Dhamdha District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - The Collector District Durg Chhattisgarh

3 - The Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh

4 - The Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Dhamdha, District Durg Chhattisgarh

5 - The Gram Panchayat Khairjhiti Through Its Secretary, Gram Panchayat Khairjhiti, Janpad Panchayat Dhamdha, District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Utkarsh Patel, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Mr. Shaleen Singh Baghel, GA

ASHUTOSH MISHRA
Digitally signed by ASHUTOSH MISHRA
Date: 2026.11.03 18:03:15 +0530

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Bibhu Datta Guru)

Order on Board

02/11/2026

1. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the notice dated 19.10.2026, issued in connection with the allegations of irregularities concerning beneficiaries under the Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Gramin), whereby the petitioner was called upon to submit his reply in relation to the proposed departmental/disciplinary proceedings.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already submitted his reply to the impugned notice on 23.10.2026, denying the allegations levelled against him and explaining his position. It is contended that the petitioner has been sought to be proceeded against merely on account of his relationship with the beneficiaries and, therefore, the impugned notice deserves to be quashed.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the petition and submits that the writ petition challenging the show-cause notice is not maintainable at this stage. It is contended that the petitioner has already submitted his reply to the impugned notice on 23.10.2026 and has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition on 26.10.2026, i.e., barely three days thereafter. Learned State counsel, therefore, submits that the petition is premature, as the competent authority has yet to consider the reply submitted by the petitioner and take an appropriate decision in accordance with law.

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

5. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and perused the material available on record, this Court finds that the petitioner has submitted his reply to the impugned notice on 23.10.2026

and has approached this Court on 26.10.2026, without awaiting consideration of his reply by the competent authority. It is a settled principle of law that ordinarily, a writ petition challenging a show-cause notice issued in contemplation of departmental proceedings is not maintainable, unless the notice is shown to have been issued without jurisdiction or interference is otherwise warranted in exceptional circumstances. At this stage, the competent authority has yet to consider the petitioner's reply and take a decision on the allegations levelled against him.

6. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned notice at this preliminary stage. The petitioner is expected to pursue the proceedings before the competent authority, which shall consider his reply and take an appropriate decision in accordance with law.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as premature at this stage.

SD/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
JUDGE

ashu