



2026:CGHC:13305

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 2720 of 2021**

1 - Rohit Kumar Dugga S/o Shri Binde Singh Dugga Aged About 35 Years R/o Village Bogar Tehsil Bhanupratappur, District Kanker North Baster Chhattisgarh
... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Revenue Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2 - Commissioner (Revenue) Land Record Raipur Division Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3 - Collector Bijapur, District Bijapur Chhattisgarh
4 - Sub Divisional Officer Bhopalpatnam Cum Enquiry Officer, Tehsil Bhopalpatnam District Bijapur Chhattisgarh
5 - Tahsildar Bhopalpatnam, District Bijapur Chhattisgarh ---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. KPS Gandhi, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Anway Tiwari, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**Order on Board****19.03.2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking following relief(s) :

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus, order or directions to the respondent authorities and be set aside the impugned penalty order dated 12.01.2021 Annexure P/1 as ab-intio.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be further pleased to pass the order for restoring the service of the petitioner with all the consequential benefits and back wages.

10.3 Any other relief may also be granted in favour of the Petitioner, as may deem fit by this Hon'ble as per the facts and circumstances of the case.”



2. Mr. Gandhi, Advocate appearing for the petitioner would submit that at the relevant time, the petitioner was working on the post of Patwari. He would further submit the petitioner was removed from services by the Sub-Divisional Officer (Revenue) in a departmental inquiry vide order dated 12.01.2021. He would contend that Inquiry Officer and Disciplinary Authority were required to comply with the provisions of the Chhattisgarh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1966 (for short 'the CCA Rules, 1966'). He would further contend that sufficient opportunity of hearing was not afforded and the documents were not provided. He would pray to set aside the order dated 12.01.2021.
3. On the other hand, learned Panel Lawyer appearing for the State would oppose submissions made by Mr. Gandhi. He would submit that the order passed by the Disciplinary Authority is appealable according to the provision of the Rules of 1966.
4. Heard.
5. Taking into consideration the fact that the order is appealable one, at this juncture, this petition is **disposed of** reserving liberty in favour of the petitioner to prefer an appeal before the Appellate Authority and in turn, it is expected that the Appellate Authority would decide it strictly in accordance with law.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge