



2025:CGHC:38774



2025:CGHC:38774
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1194 of 2023

R.B. Singh S/o Late Shivnandan Singh Aged About 51 Years R/o Village Bhati, Post Satwakheda, Police Station Sareni, District : Rae Bareli, Uttar Pradesh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - Union Of India Through The Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs, Shashtri Bhavan, New Delhi – 110001.

2 - Director General Central Industrial Security Force, Office At Lodhi Road, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi-110003.

3 - Inspector General Central Industrial Security Force, Office At Lodhi Road, C.G.O. Complex, New Delhi-110003.

4 - Deputy Inspector General Central Industrial Security Force Unit, Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Priyanka Rai, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr. Bhupendra Pandey, Central Govt. Counsel

Hon'ble Shri Amitendra Kishore Prasad, Judge

Order on Board

05.08.2025

- The petitioner has filed this writ petition with the following relief(s):-

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to quash the impugned order dated 07/05/2022 and direct the respondent



authority to take up the revision application of the present petitioner, and decide the same in accordance with law.

10.2 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief, as it may deem fit and appropriate."

2. Brief facts of the case, are that The petitioner was initially appointed as Constable (General Duty) with the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) and was posted at CISF Unit, BSP, Bhilai, District Durg. A departmental enquiry was instituted against him on charges of disobedience and indiscipline. Pursuant to the enquiry, the Disciplinary Authority (respondent No. 4), vide order dated 03.10.2012, imposed the penalty of removal from service. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority, i.e., respondent No. 3 (Inspector General, Western Command), which was dismissed vide order dated 11.01.2013. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a revision application dated 26.07.2021 under Rule 54 of the Central Industrial Security Force Rules, 2001, before respondent No. 2. However, the revision application was rejected on the ground that it was "badly time barred," without considering the merits of the case and without appreciating the fact that the petitioner was suffering from Bell's Palsy, was declared unfit, and remained under medication from 11.02.2013 to 15.07.2018. The rejection of the revision solely on the ground of limitation, which is arbitrary and illegal.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire disciplinary proceedings conducted against the petitioner were in gross violation of the provisions of the Central Industrial Security Force Rules, 2001. It is contended that the penalty of removal from service was imposed in a mechanical manner without affording due compliance with the principles of natural justice. As a result, the petitioner has been out of employment since 2012 and is undergoing grave hardship, including financial distress. It is further submitted that the petitioner had preferred a revision petition under Rule 54 of the CISF Rules, 2001, before the respondent No. 2, raising substantial grounds including procedural irregularities in the enquiry and his prolonged medical condition. However, the said revision was rejected solely on the ground that it was “badly time barred,” without considering the genuine and justifiable reasons for the delay. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was diagnosed with a serious medical condition Bell’s Palsy and was under treatment from 11.02.2013 till 15.07.2018. Despite submission of relevant medical certificates evidencing his incapacity to pursue legal remedies during that period, respondent No. 2 failed to consider the same and rejected the revision application in a wholly arbitrary, mechanical, and inhumane manner. It is further urged that respondent No. 2, being a public authority and the competent Revisional Authority, was duty bound to adjudicate the petitioner’s revision on merits after granting a reasonable opportunity of hearing. Instead, the revision



was dismissed without due application of mind and in utter disregard of the petitioner's medical condition and the evidence placed on record. Accordingly, the instant petition be allowed and the impugned order rejecting the revision application on technical grounds be set aside and the matter be remanded back for reconsideration on merits.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondents opposes the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the documents available with the writ petition.
6. Upon perusal of the impugned order passed by respondent No.2, it is evident that the same is a non-speaking and unreasoned order, wherein the revision application filed by the petitioner has been rejected solely on the ground of being "badly time barred," without adverting to or considering the specific grounds raised by the petitioner, particularly his prolonged medical condition and the supporting medical certificates.
7. It is a settled principle of law that administrative and quasi-judicial authorities, while exercising statutory powers, are required to pass speaking and reasoned orders. The requirement of recording reasons is an essential component of the principles of natural justice, which not only ensures transparency but also enables the aggrieved party to understand the basis of the decision and



facilitates judicial review, if necessary. The cryptic nature of the impugned order reflects non-application of mind and failure to exercise jurisdiction in accordance with law.

8. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order cannot be sustained in the eyes of law. Accordingly, the same is hereby quashed and set aside. The matter is remitted back to respondent No. 2 for fresh consideration of the revision application submitted by the petitioner, strictly in accordance with law. Respondent No. 2 is directed to consider all relevant materials placed on record by the petitioner, including his medical condition during the relevant period, and pass a reasoned and speaking order after granting the petitioner an opportunity of personal hearing. The entire exercise shall be completed within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.
9. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case. All issues are left open to be considered and decided by respondent No.2 independently on their own merits.
10. With the aforesaid observations/directions, instant writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

**(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge**