



2026:CGHC:17732-DB



2026:CGHC:17732-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPIL No. 21 of 2026

1 - Divisional Secretary, Bhartiya Postal Employees Association (Group -C)
Durg Division (Chhattisgarh) Through Divisional Secretary Santosh Kumar
Sahu S/o Late Bisali Ram Sahu, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Quarter No. 17-B,
E-Pocket, Maroda Sector Bhilai, District- Durg (C.G.)

2 - Divisional Secretary Bhartiya Postal Employees Association (Postman
And Mts) Durg Division, (Chhattisgarh) Through Divisional Secretary Krishna
Kumar Padmashali S/o Late Sitaram, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Hanuman
Nagar, Durg, District- Durg (C.G.)

... Petitioners

versus

1 - Union Of India Ministry Of Communications, Director General / Secretary,
Department Of Posts, Dak Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi 110001.

2 - Chief Postmaster General Chhattisgarh Circle, Raipur, District- Raipur
(C.G.)

3 - Senior Superintendent Of Post Offices Durg Division, Civic Center Bhilai,
District - Durg (C.G.)

4 - Superintendent Of Post Offices Durg Division, Civic Center Bhilai, District
- Durg (C.G.)

---- Respondents

(Cause title taken from Case Information System)



For Petitioners	:	Mr. Abhinav Tiwari. Advocate
Respondent/UOI	:	Mr. Ramakant Mishra, DSGI

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, C.J.

20/04/2026

1. The present writ petition (PIL) has been preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by the petitioners, who are office bearers of the Bhartiya Postal Employees Association (Group-C) and Bhartiya Postal Employees Association (Postman & MTS), Durg Division, calling in question the legality, validity and propriety of the impugned orders dated 14.01.2026 and 06.02.2026 issued by respondent No.1 & 2, whereby the Durg Postal Division has been downgraded from Class-I (Group-A) Division to Class-II (Group-B) Division in the Chhattisgarh Circle, while simultaneously upgrading Bilaspur Postal Division from Class-II (Group-B) to Class-I (Group-A). The petitioners, espousing a public cause, have contended that the impugned action is arbitrary, without any justifiable reason, and has been taken without affording any opportunity of hearing or consultation to the Divisional Office, Durg (respondent No.3), despite the fact that the Durg Division fulfills all the prescribed norms and standards required for a Class-I Division. It is further pleaded that the impugned downgrading would adversely affect the administrative autonomy, service conditions, and disciplinary control of the employees working under Durg Division, compelling them to approach the Raipur Circle Office even for routine



matters, thereby causing serious prejudice and disruption in the smooth functioning of the Division.

2. The present writ petition (PIL) has been filed by the petitioners seeking for the following reliefs:

“10.1) The Hon’ble court kindly be pleased to call the entire record from the possession of respondent authorities for kind perusal.

10.2) That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue an appropriate writ by setting aside the impugned order dated 14.01.2026 and 06.02.2026 (Annexure P/1 & P/2) passed by the office of respondent no.1 & 2.

10.3) Any other relief, which may be suitable in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. The facts of the case as emerges from the pleadings of the petition are that, the petitioners, who are registered employees' associations of the Durg Postal Division, have instituted the present Public Interest Litigation challenging the impugned orders dated 14.01.2026 and 06.02.2026 issued by respondent Nos. 1 and 2, whereby the Durg Postal Division has been downgraded from Class-I (Group-A) to Class-II (Group-B), while simultaneously upgrading the Bilaspur Postal Division from Class-II to Class-I. The grievance of the petitioners is confined to the downgrading of the Durg Division, which, according to them, has been done arbitrarily, without assigning any reasons and



without affording any opportunity of hearing or consultation to the Divisional Office, Durg. It has been contended that the Durg Division fulfills all the prescribed norms and criteria for maintaining its Class-I status, as is evident from the establishment strength and other relevant parameters obtained under the Right to Information Act, and further that Durg–Bhilai is classified as a ‘Y’ category city, thereby justifying its existing status.

It is further pleaded that the impugned downgrading has serious administrative and service-related repercussions on the employees of the Durg Division, as it curtails the powers of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices and necessitates employees to approach the Raipur Circle Office for disciplinary and other official matters, leading to inconvenience, delay, and disruption in the functioning of the Division. The petitioners submit that despite submitting representations through proper channel, including to the higher authorities and federation, no action has been taken for reconsideration of the impugned decision. According to the petitioners, the impugned orders are arbitrary, malafide, and contrary to the established norms, and therefore liable to be set aside by this Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the impugned orders dated 14.01.2026 and 06.02.2026, whereby the Durg Postal Division has been downgraded from Class-I (Group-A) to Class-II (Group-B), are wholly arbitrary, unreasonable and unsustainable in the eyes of law. It is contended that the said decision has been taken



without assigning any reasons and in complete violation of the principles of natural justice, as no opportunity of hearing or consultation was afforded to the Divisional Office, Durg. Learned counsel would further submit that the Durg Division fulfills all the prescribed norms and standards required for a Class-I Division, which is evident from the establishment strength and official communications obtained under the Right to Information Act, and also considering that Durg-Bhilai is a 'Y' category city. It is thus argued that in absence of any adverse material or deficiency, the downgrading of the Division is manifestly arbitrary and reflects non-application of mind on the part of the respondent authorities.

It is further submitted that the impugned action has serious civil and administrative consequences, as it adversely affects the service conditions, administrative autonomy and disciplinary powers of the Durg Division. Learned counsel would argue that due to the downgrading, the employees of the Division would now be compelled to approach the Raipur Circle Office even for routine disciplinary and administrative matters, which would not only cause undue hardship and delay but also hamper the efficient functioning of the Division. It is also contended that despite submitting detailed representations through proper channel, the respondent authorities have failed to consider the grievances of the petitioners, thereby rendering the impugned decision arbitrary and malafide. On these grounds, learned counsel prays that the impugned orders deserve to be set aside by this Court.



5. Per contra, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India appearing for the respondent/Union of India would submit that the impugned orders dated 14.01.2026 and 06.02.2026 have been issued strictly in accordance with the administrative policy, functional requirements and cadre restructuring norms of the Department of Posts, and the same do not suffer from any illegality or arbitrariness warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It is contended that the classification, upgradation or downgrading of Postal Divisions is a matter of policy decision based on various factors such as workload, revenue generation, administrative exigencies and overall efficiency, and the petitioners have no vested right to claim continuation of a particular status. Learned DSGI would further submit that principles of natural justice are not attracted in such policy matters, and no prior hearing is required before taking such administrative decisions. It is also argued that the petitioners have an efficacious alternative remedy of making representation before the competent authority, and in absence of any violation of statutory provisions or fundamental rights, the present Public Interest Litigation is misconceived and deserves to be dismissed.
6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and considered their rival submissions made herein above and also gone through the entire records of the case with utmost circumspection.
7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon careful consideration of the pleadings and material placed on record, this Court finds that the present petition, though couched as a Public



Interest Litigation, in substance pertains to a service/administrative grievance relating to the downgrading of a particular Postal Division and its consequential effect on a defined class of employees. It is now well-settled by a consistent line of decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court that Public Interest Litigation cannot be invoked to ventilate personal grievances, service disputes or matters relating to cadre restructuring and administrative policy. In **Ashok Kumar Pandey v. State of West Bengal**, (2004) 3 SCC 349 the Hon'ble Supreme Court cautioned that courts must be "extremely careful" to ensure that PIL jurisdiction is not abused for oblique motives and emphasized that personal interest cannot be enforced under the garb of public interest.

8. Further, in **Kalyaneshwari v. Union of India**, (2011) 3 SCC 287 it has been categorically held that petitions lacking bona fides or motivated by extraneous considerations amount to abuse of process of law and deserve to be dismissed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal**, (2010) 3 SCC 402 has further laid down that Courts must discourage frivolous or motivated PILs by imposing exemplary costs so as to preserve the sanctity of this extraordinary jurisdiction. Recent judicial trends also indicate a strict approach against misuse of PIL jurisdiction, with the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterating its disapproval of frivolous petitions and indicating imposition of costs to deter such practices.
9. Applying the aforesaid settled principles to the facts of the present case, this Court is of the considered view that the grievance raised by the petitioners is essentially personal/service-oriented, lacking any



element of genuine public interest affecting the community at large. The petitioners have failed to demonstrate violation of any fundamental or statutory right warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Entertaining such petitions would amount to permitting misuse of the PIL jurisdiction, which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly cautioned against.

10. Accordingly, the present writ petition (PIL) deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**. It is further directed that the security deposit amount of Rs. 15,000/- deposited on 09.04.2026 by the petitioners before this Hon'ble Court for filing the present writ petition (PIL) shall stand forfeited.

Sd/-
(**Ravindra Kumar Agrawal**)
Judge

Sd/-
(**Ramesh Sinha**)
Chief Justice

ved