



2026:CGHC:18615



2026:CGHC:18615

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 938 of 2021**

Govind Singh @ Nand Kishore Singh, S/o Late Baijnath Singh, Aged About 65 Years Caste Rajput, R/o Secl Colony, 1 - B, Vishrampur, Police Station Vishrampur, Tahsil And District Surajpur Chhattisgarh. ... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - South Eastern Coalfield Limited, Through - Its Chief Managing Director, Office At Seepat Road, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Chief Vigilance Officer, Secl, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Chief General Manager, Secl, Vishrampur, Area Rehar Coal Mines, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh., District : Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Munmun Singh, S/o Late Jay Govind Singh, Aged About 41 Years Occupation - Foreman At Rehar Mines, R/o 2- A -123, Secl Colony, Vishrampur, Police Station Vishrampur, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh., District : Surajpur, Chhattisgarh. ... **Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner	: Mr. Punit Ruparel, Advocate
For Respondents No.1 to 3	: Mr. Sudhir Kumar Bajpai, Advocate
For Respondent No.4	: Mr. Shashi Bhushan Tiwari, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**Order on Board****23/04/2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking the following relief:-

i. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No.1 to 3 to initiate departmental enquiry against the respondent No.4 on the complaint of the petitioner.

ii. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No.1 to 3 to terminate the job of respondent No.4.



iii. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call the entire record pertaining to the case of respondent No. 4.

iv. Cost of the petition may also be granted to the petitioner.

v. Any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper, may also, kindly be granted to the petitioner in the interest of justice."

2. Facts of the present case in brief are as under:-

- A. Lal Govind Singh was an employee of SECL. He was declared medically unfit in the year 2002. Respondent No. 4, the adopted son of Lal Govind Singh, applied for dependent employment. The application submitted by Respondent No. 4 was accepted by the SECL authorities, and he was offered appointment on 15.07.2002 on the post of General Mazdoor.
- B. Respondent No. 4 is the real son of Jai Govind Singh. Lal Govind Singh and Jai Govind Singh are real brothers. Lal Govind Singh was issueless; therefore, he adopted Respondent No. 4.
- C. Respondent No. 4 is living with Lal Govind Singh since childhood, and he pursued his studies there and in his mark sheets, the name of his father is recorded as Lal Govind Singh.
- D. The petitioner is the brother of Lal Govind Singh and Jai Govind Singh. There was a property dispute between the three brothers. The petitioner made a complaint on 03.08.2019 alleging that Respondent No. 4 is not an adopted son of Lal Govind Singh and he has secured employment by submitting false documents.
- E. An FIR was registered against Respondent No. 4 and during the course of investigation, statements of witnesses were recorded. In their statements, it was stated that Respondent No. 4 is residing with Lal Govind Singh since childhood, and consent has been given by the petitioner in favour of Respondent No. 4.



- F. SECL conducted a detailed enquiry and found no substance in the complaint made by the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that Respondent No. 4 has not produced an adoption deed to establish that he is the adopted son of Lal Govind Singh. He would further submit that there is manipulation in the mark sheets submitted by Respondent No. 4. He would also submit that though the SECL authorities conducted a detailed enquiry but recorded findings in favour of Respondent No. 4 without affording any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner; thus, he prayed to quash the order of appointment issued in favour of Respondent No. 4.
 4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 3 would submit that a detailed enquiry was conducted by SECL, and relevant educational documents of Respondent No. 4 were examined. He would further submit that name of Lal Govind Singh is entered as the father of Respondent No. 4 in all mark sheets and other educational documents, and consent has already been given by the petitioner in favour of Respondent No. 4. He would contend that an FIR was registered against Respondent No. 4, and the statement of the petitioner was recorded, wherein he admitted that Respondent No. 4 is adopted son of Lal Govind Singh. He would argue that the petitioner has approached after 17 years without any justification; thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed.
 5. Learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 4 would support the arguments advanced by Respondent No. 3.
 6. Heard learned counsel appearing for the respective parties and perused the documents with due circumspection.
 7. Admittedly, Respondent No. 4 was offered dependent employment on 15.07.2002, whereas the complaint was made by the petitioner before



the SECL authorities on 03.08.2019. The petitioner has failed to offer any proper justification for such delay.

8. Perusal of the return filed by SECL would reveal that a detailed enquiry was conducted, and no substance was found in the complaint made by the petitioner. An FIR was also registered against Respondent No. 4, and during the course of investigation, the statement of the petitioner was recorded, wherein he admitted that Respondent No. 4 has been residing with Lal Govind Singh since childhood. He further admitted that consent was given by him in favour of Respondent No. 4 to provide him employment.
9. The FIR registered against Respondent No. 4 has already been quashed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in CRMP No. 1741 of 2023 vide order dated 26.07.2024, which has not been disputed by the learned counsel(s) appearing for the respective parties.
10. With regard to the submission of non-production of an adoption deed, as raised by the petitioner, the burden lies on him to prove this fact. It is admitted that Respondent No. 4 has been living with Lal Govind Singh since childhood; therefore, the petitioner cannot be permitted to deviate from his earlier statement.
11. Since, the issue of adoption is of civil nature, such an issue cannot be adjudicated under writ jurisdiction.
12. Further, the petitioner has approached this Court after 17 years without any justification.
13. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, no case is made out for interference, accordingly, the petition is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE