

GAHC010168772021



2026:GAU-AS:3008

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/5842/2021

4186/M RANDHIR SINGH SECURITY AGENCY
A REGISTERED SECURITY AGENCY UNDER THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF
RESETTLEMENT (DGR) UNDER THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE, HAVING ITS
REGISTERED OFFICE AT VIBGYOR COMPLEX, LALMATI NH 37,
GUWAHATI 781029, ASSAM AND IS REPRESENTED BY ITS PROPRIETOR,
COL. (RETD) M. RANDHIR SINGH, SON OF SRI M. NAWAL SINGH, AGED
ABOUT 59 YEARS, RESIDENT OF GAMES VILLAGE, A/31, 501, NH 37,
GUWAHATI , ASSAM

VERSUS

FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA AND ANR
ASSAM, REGION, G.S ROAD, PALTAN BAZAR, ABOVE FBB, MT TOWER,
(3RD FLOOR) GUWAHATI , KAMRUP (M) ASSAM, 781008, AND IS
REPRESENTED BY THE GENERAL MANAGER (REGION)

2:THE DIVISIONAL MANAGER

FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA
DIVISIONAL OFFICE
STEAMERGHAT ROAD
SILCHAR
ASSAM
783380
(ERSTWHILE THE NOMENCLATURE FOR THE POST OF RESPONDENT NO.
2 WAS AREA MANAGER

Advocate for the petitioner(s): Mr. D Deka

Advocate for the respondent(s): Mr. PK Roy, Standing Counsel,
FCI
Ms. A Chakraborty

B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEVASHIS BARUAH
ORDER

26.02.2026

Heard Mr. D Deka, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners. I have also heard Mr. PK Roy, the learned Senior Counsel, assisted by Ms. A Chakraborty, the learned counsel, who represents the respondent Nos.1 and 2.

2. The grievances of the petitioners herein is that the petitioners were not paid for the reliever on the 7th day of the week by the respondent authorities which was contrary to the guidelines issued by the Director General of Resettlement which the respondent Nos.1 and 2 were bound to do so.

3. The materials on record show that the work order was issued to the petitioner for deploying 34 numbers of Security Guards which consisted of 3 Supervisors and 31 un-armed guards. It is an admitted fact that these Security Guards are required to be deployed on rotation basis.

4. Mr. PK Roy, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submitted that the Guards who were asked to be deployed by the petitioners was taking into account that the Reliever on the 7th day would be amongst the 31 Security Guards so appointed. The question, therefore, arises as

to whether the Guards, who acted as a Reliever was one amongst the 31 Security Guards or the petitioners had to engage somebody else taking into account that the 31 Security Guards so deployed would not be sufficient to act as a Reliever on the 7th day.

5. The above questions can only be decided in a proceedings where evidence can be led to the effect as to whether the 31 unarmed Security Guards were sufficient to act amongst themselves as a Reliever for the 7th day or the petitioner had to appoint some other personnel to act as a Reliever.

6. Considering that these aspects would involve various disputed questions of facts, which can only be adjudicated in a Forum wherein evidence can be led, this Court is not inclined to entertain the instant writ petition and the same stands dismissed.

7. It is, however, observed that the dismissal of the instant writ petition shall not preclude the petitioner to approach the Competent Court of Civil Jurisdiction and the period during which the instant writ petition has been pending i.e.05.10.2021 till date be excluded while computing the period of limitation.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant