



2026:CGHC:18555-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPCR No. 225 of 2026

Ramkumar Anjan S/o Mannu Anjan Aged About 40 Years R/o Karhibazar, Diparapara, Outpost - Karhibazar, P.S. - City Kotwali, Balodabazar Distt. Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs (Public), New Raipur (C.G.)

2 - District Magistrate District Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)

3 - Superintendent Of Police District Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)

4 - Station House Officer P.S. - Karahibazar, Balodabazar, District Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Pragalbha Sharma, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. N. K. Jaiswal, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

23.04.2026

1. Heard Mr. Pragalbha Shrama, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. N. K. Jaiswal, learned Deputy Govt.

Advocate appearing for the Respondents/State.

2. By way of this petition, the petitioner has prayed for following reliefs:-

“10.1 To kindly set-aside/quash the impugned order dated 05.02.2026 (Annexure P-1), passed by the Respondent No.02;

10.2 To kindly direct the Respondent No.1 & 2 to conduct enquiry into the matter and take disciplinary actions against the respondent No.3 & 4.

10.3 To permit the Petitioner to re-enter the revenue limits of Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara and the nine neighboring districts to resume his professional duties as a lineman.

10.4 To impose appropriate cost on the Respondent authorities for illegally passing the impugned order and for harassing and humiliating the petitioner
10.5 To declare the order as unconstitutional and void, as it violates the Petitioner's fundamental rights to movement and livelihood under Articles 19(1)(d) and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India.

10.6 Any other relief(s), direction(s), which Hon'ble the Court deems fit, and proper, in the circumstances of the case.”.

3. By way of this petition the Petitioner is challenging the Externment Order dated 05.02.2026, passed by the District Magistrate, Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara in Criminal Case No. 202602210100005. By the said order, the Petitioner has been banished from the limits of Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara and its

neighbouring districts (Bilaspur, Raipur, Raigarh, Mahasamund, Mungeli, Janjgir-Champa, Bemetara, Sakti, and Sarangarh-Bilaigarh) for a period of one year.

4. Remedy of filing an appeal is provided under Section 9 of the CG *Rajya Suraksha Adhiniyam*, 1990 (for short, 'Adhiniyam 1990') that a person aggrieved by an order passed under Sections 3, 4, or 5 of the CG State Security Act, 1990 by the District Magistrate, or any other Officer, may file an appeal to the State Government within 30 days from the date of such order.
5. It is necessary to notice Section 9 of the Adhiniyam 1990 here below:

(1) Any person aggrieved by an order under Section 3, 4, 5 or 6 made by the District Magistrate or any other officer specially empowered under Section 13 may appeal to the State Government within thirty days from the date of such order. Such appeal shall be decided as far as possible within a period of four months of the date of filing of the appeal.

(2) An appeal under this section shall be preferred in the form of a memorandum setting forth concisely the grounds of objection to the order appealed against, and shall be accompanied by a certified copy thereof.

(3) On receipt of such appeal, the State Government may after giving a reasonable opportunity to the

appellant to be heard either personally or by a legal practitioner and after such further inquiry, if any, as it may deem necessary confirm, vary or rescind the order appealed against :

Provided that the order appealed against shall remain in operation pending the disposal of the appeal, unless the State Government otherwise directs.

(4) In calculating the period of thirty days provided for an appeal under this Section, the time taken for granting a certified copy of the order appealed against shall be excluded.

6. In view of above provision of Section 9 of the Adhiniyam 1990, and the order of the present case, we are not inclined to interfere with the externment order dated 05.02.2026 (Annexure P1).
7. Accordingly, present petition stands disposed of reserving liberty to the petitioner to avail alternative statutory remedy available to him under the law, if so advised.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice