



AMITA  
DUBEY

2026:CGHC:9767

NAFR

Digitally  
signed by  
AMITA  
DUBEY  
Date:  
2026.03.11  
11:06:40  
+0530

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### WPS No. 6215 of 2018

Pranav Shekhar S/o Ramchandra Singh Aged About 40 Years Presently Deployed As Deputy Commandant Kistaram Camp, 208 Cobra, Central Reserve Police Force, P.S. Kistaram, District- Sukma, Chhattisgarh., District : Sukuma, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

**versus**

- 1 - Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Home Affairs, Police Division-1, Pma Cell, North Block New Delhi., District : New Delhi, Delhi.
- 2 - Director General Of Police Central Reserve Police Force (Crpf), C.G.O. Complex New Delhi., District : New Delhi, Delhi.
- 3 - Director General Of Police Chhattisgarh Police, Police Head Quarters Raipur, District- District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 4 - Inspector General Of Police Bastar Range, District- Bastar, Chhattisgarh., District : Bastar(Jagdalpur), Chhattisgarh.
- 5 - Superintendent Of Police Sukma District- Sukma, Chhattisgarh., District : Sukuma, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

|                      |                                                 |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | : Mr. Yashkaran Singh, Advocate                 |
| For Res. Nos. 1 & 2  | : Ms. Anmol Sharma, Advocate                    |
| For Res. Nos. 3 to 5 | : Mr. Rohitashva Singh, Dy. Government Advocate |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput**

**Order On Board**

**24/02/2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1. That, this Hon'ble May kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ, order, direction and quash the impugned letter dated 07.07.2017(AnnexureP/1).

10.2 That, this Hon'ble may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to recommend the name of the petitioner for grant of Gallantry Award/President Police Medal.

10.3. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief as it may deems fit and appropriate.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that instant writ petition has been filed against the arbitrary and illegal action of respondent No. 3 whereby respondent No. 3 has rejected/refused to recommend the name of the petitioner for grant of Gallantry Award /President Police Medal in a most arbitrary and illegal manner without application of mind, without going through the records and without assigning any reason. He also submits that during his posting in the Naxal infested area of District Sukma the petitioner received reliable information about the naxalite activities in the area near the Jungle between Melasood and Palanj mela. An operation was launched on 12.01.2016 under the leadership of the petitioner, who was working as Deputy Commandant at that time. During the search operation in the Jungle 8-9 Armed Naxals were sighted. When the petitioner's team reached the distance of 80 meter from the naxals, the naxals started indiscriminate firing from all directions. The petitioner's team took position and launched counter attack killing armed Naxals. The team displayed exemplary courage and Gallantry and where able to destabilize the naxals. A court of enquiry was conducted by the C.R.P.F. and the name of the petitioner was recommended for Gallantry Award/President Police Medal. The name of the petitioner was also

recommended to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs. An enquiry was also conducted by the Executive Magistrate and the valor of the petitioner was found to be true and the office of the Superintendent of Police as well as the officer of Inspector General of Police of the State of Chhattisgarh also recommended the name of the petitioner for Gallantry award. The respondent No. 3 however ignored all the recommendations and the findings of the Court of enquiry and rejected the name of the petitioner by a laconic order without assigning any reason. He further submits that the petitioner alongwith other persons, who were the parties in the said operation, were denied Gallantry Award/President Police Medal by the impugned communication dated 07.07.2017 by respondent No. 3. He submits that the impugned order is a cryptic one and does not give reason as to why the recommendation was not made. Thus, he submits that the impugned order may be set aside and the respondents may be directed to recommend the name of the petitioner for the Gallantry award to the State Government.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents No. 1 & 2 submits that the petitioner can make a claim only for consideration for recommendation of grant of gallantry award/President Police Medal and this Court cannot direct for grant of such Gallantry Award/President Police Medal to the petitioner. He placed reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme court in case of **Manjunath Gouli Vs. Union of India and Ors**<sup>1</sup> in support of his submission. She submits that a committee was constituted comprising five senior Police Officials from the Cadre of Director General, up to Superintendent of Police and the said Committee has assessed the roles played by the members of the search operation that took place in the above stated Naxal infested area which after detailed analysis, gave its report. It did not find the case of the petitioner

---

1 2021 SCC Online Del 5309

for being recommended for Gallantry Award/President Police Medal. He further submits that assessment was made by the Senior Police officials on the material available on record and the role played by the petitioner in the aforesaid naxal operation, which cannot be replaced by this Court's own finding. Being thus, the petition is argued to be worth dismissal.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused material available on record.

5. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Manjunath Gouli vs. Union of India and others** (supra) has held as under :-

“7. In the opinion of this Court, the Petitioner has only a right for consideration of his name for the PMG award but he has no legal right to an award/medal. Further this Court in writ jurisdiction does not confer a gallantry award but it examines only the decision making process and at the highest can only direct the Respondents to consider the Petitioner's request for an award. In the present instance, Petitioner's name for PMG had been considered and declined by the CRPF at the highest level. Accordingly, this Court does not find any illegality in the decision making process by the Respondents.”

6. Though the petitioner's claim is that he had actively and bravely participated in the Naxal operation as stated above, yet he has been denied the recommendation for Gallantry Award/President Police Medal. Perusal of the document (Annexure R/2) annexed with the return, which is the minutes of the meeting convened on 06.07.2017 with respect to recommend the award of Gallantry Award/President Police Medal, which was comprising of five senior

police officials from the cadre of Special Director General, Naxal Operations, Director General of Police, CRPF, Deputy Inspector General of Police, Naxal Operations, Assistant Inspector General, Naxal Operations and Superintendent of Police. Case of the petitioner was also considered by the Committee and on assessment of the role played, a decision was taken not to recommend the name of petitioner for Gallantry Award/President Police Medal. The said decision of the Committee was duly communicated by respondent No. 3 to the State Government. From perusal of the record, it also appears that assessment was made by the Committee for such purpose and eventually it came to the conclusion not to recommend the name of petitioner for Gallantry Award/President Police Medal. It is to be seen that the committee constituted comprised of high level police officials for the said purpose having expertise in assessing the role played by the petitioner in naxal operation. Thus, this Court is not inclined to substitute its wisdom to give a different opinion by setting aside the impugned order (Annexure P-1) dated 18.04.2017.

7. In light of the afore-cited judgment (supra) and in view of the foregoing discussion, the writ petition, being devoid of substance, is liable to be and is hereby dismissed. No cost (s).

Sd/-  
**(Sachin Singh Rajput )**  
**Judge**

*Ami*