



2026:CGHC:10281



2026:CGHC:10281

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 888 of 2026

1 - Dr. Kundleshwar Panigrahi S/o Shri Goverdhan Panigrahi Aged About 52 Years (Partner-Cum-Director), Centre For Ground Water Recharge, Residents Of Plot No. 90/a, Sector- 2, Geetanjali Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Jal Shakti (MOJS), Department Of Water Resources, River Development And Ganga Rejuvenation (Rnggwtri), 18/11, Jamnagar House, Mansingh Road, New Delhi

2 - The Director/ Regional Director Rajiv Gandhi National Ground Water Training And Research Institute (RGNGWTRI), Central Ground Water Board, Sector- 23, Tuta, Nava Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Chairman Central Ground Water Authority (CGWA) CSMRS Campus, Olof Palme Marg, Hauz Khas, New Delhi

... **Respondents**

(Cause title, as taken from CIS system)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Somnath Verma, Advocate
For Respondents/UOI	: Ms. Anmol Sharma, CGC

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

27/02/2026

1. Heard.



2. This petition has been preferred by petitioner under Article 226 of the

Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate direction to the respondent authority to decide the petitioner's representation (Ann.-P/4) at the earliest within appropriate time. Further, may kindly direct the respondent authority to withdraw the Notice dated 14.07.2025 and re-issue new with clarification, in the interest of justice.

10.2 That, the Hon'ble Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents to adopt a renewal-based framework grounded in past compliance, professional experience, and performance evaluation.

10.3 That, the Hon'ble Court may further be pleased to pass any order or issue any suitable writ of superintendence as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit under the circumstances of the case including the cost of the petition.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a Certificate of Accreditation (Certificate No. CGWA/RGI/024) (Annexure -P/1) was issued by respondent No.2 in favour of the petitioner under the Policy of June, 2021 as Ground Water Professionals. The certificate is valid for the period from 01.10.2021 to 30.09.2026. Thereafter, the petitioner has been practicing lawfully, complying with all regulatory requirements, reporting obligations and professional standards prescribed by the competent authority. He further submits that respondent No.2 issued a notice dated 14.07.2025 (Annexure -P/2) regarding the extension of validity of accreditation of Ground Water Professionals, whereby a one-time extension was granted up to 31.03.2026, or until the online accreditation portal being developed by



QCI-NABET becomes fully functional, whichever is earlier. He next submits that since the certificate issued in favour of the petitioner is valid till 30.09.2026, therefore, he ought not to have been compelled to seek accreditation as per the new decision taken by the National Board of Accreditation for Ground Water Professionals in its second meeting held on 03.07.2025. Lastly, he submits that the petitioner filed a representation dated 29.12.2025 (Annexure -P/4) before respondent No.1 through respondent No.2 for redressal of his grievance, but the same has not been decided yet. Hence, learned counsel submits that, at this stage, the present writ petition may be disposed of with a direction to respondent Nos.1 & 2 to decide the said representation filed by petitioner. Till such decision is taken, the respondents may be directed not to take any coercive step against the petitioner till the validity period of the certificate, i.e., up to 30.09.2026. However, learned counsel submits that the petitioner is ready to file a fresh representation before respondent No.2 for redressal of his grievance.

4. In reply, learned counsel for respondents submits that in the representation dated 29.12.2025 (Annexure -P/4), the petitioner did not state the fact as to when the certificate of accreditation was issued to the petitioner by respondent No.2 and what was its validity period. She further submits that, if the petitioner files a fresh representation, the same shall be considered and decided in accordance with law.
5. Having considered the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner and the submissions made by counsel for the respondents, the present writ petition is disposed of at this stage by granting liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation, mentioning all relevant facts along with supporting documents, before respondent No.2 within



a period of 15 days from today, along with a copy of this order. It is further directed that upon filing of such representation, the same shall be considered and decided by respondent No.2 within a further period of 30 days from the date of its filing, in accordance with law/rules/ policy. Till then, no coercive step shall be taken against the petitioner in respect of the notice dated 14.07.2025 (Annexure -P/2) issued by respondent No.2.

6. With aforesaid observation and direction, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.
7. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge