

GAHC010280582025



undefined

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

Case No. : WP(C)/7362/2025

SRI KAMAL DAS
EX-CT/GD, FORCE NO. 115138371, SON OF SRI ATUL CHANDRA DAS,
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- BAMUNBARI, PO- ASSAM SYNTEX, PS- TIHU,
DIST- NALBARI, ASSAM

VERSUS

THE UNION OF INDIA AND 6 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, NEW DELHI,
INDIA

2:THE DIRECTOR GENERAL
CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT OFFICE COMPLEX
NEW DELHI
PIN- 110003

3:THE SPECIAL DIRECTOR GENERAL
CENTRAL
CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE
NORTH EAST ZONE
P.O.- AMERIGOG
GUWAHATI
KAMRUP (M)
ASSAM
PIN- 781023

4:THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
NORTH EAST SECTOR
CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE
STONY HEAVEN
BISHOP COTTON ROAD
SHILLONG
MEGHALAYA- 293001

5:THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
SOUTHERN SECTOR
CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE ROAD NO.10
JUBLEE HILLS
NEW MLA/MP COLONY
GAYATRI HILLS
HYDRABAD
TELENGANA
PIN- 500033

6:THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL
RANGE
CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE KHATKHATI
DIST-KARBI ANGLONG
ASSAM

7:THE COMMANDANT
222 BATTALION CENTRAL RESERVE POLICE FORCE
NAIMED
BIJAPUR
CHATTISGAR

Advocate for the Petitioner : MS T WAPANGLA, MR. R DEKA,MR. D GOGOI

Advocate for the Respondent : DY.S.G.I.,

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN
ORDER**

18.12.2025

Heard Mr. D. Gogoi, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. M. Barman, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. S.K. Medhi, learned Central Government Counsel.

2. This petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has challenged:-

(i) the order dated 22.07.2022, passed by the Commandant, 222

Battalion, CRPF, whereby he was removed from his service;

- (ii) the order dated 21.11.2022, passed by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Khatakhati, whereby his appeal, dated 07.09.2022, was rejected and the order of his removal from service, dated 22.07.2022, was affirmed;
- (iii) the order dated 06.04.2023, passed by the Inspector General of Police, CRPF, Shillong, whereby his review petition against the orders dated 21.11.2022 and dated 07.09.2022, was rejected; and
- (iv) also prayed for issuing direction to the respondent authorities to reinstate him in service with all consequential benefits.

3. Perused the petition as well as the documents placed on record.

4. Let notice be issued to the respondents, returnable in 4 weeks. As all the respondents have been represented by their engaged counsel, no formal notice is required to be issued. However, extra requisite copy of the petition be furnished to them during the course of the day.

5. List the matter after 4 weeks.

6. In the meantime, the State respondents may file their affidavits-in-opposition.

7. It appears that some errors have crept in the prayer portion of the petition. The petitioner shall take necessary steps to rectify the same as per procedure prescribed.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant