

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

L.P.A. No. 399 of 2025

1. The Union of India through its Secretary MHA/CISF, North Block, PO & PS: North Block, New Delhi-110001.
2. The Director General, C.I.S.F., Block No. 13, C.G.O Complex, Lodhi Road, PO & PS. Lodhi Road New Delhi-110003.
3. The Inspector General, CISF, East Headquarters, Patna, PO & PS Boring Road, District: Patna, Bihar
4. The D.I.G, CISF, BCCL, Koyla Nagar, PO & PS: Koyla Nagar, District: Dhanbad, Jharkhand.
5. The Commandant, CISF Unit, Koyla Nagar, PO & PS Koyla Nagar, District: Dhanbad, Jharkhand
6. The Assistant Commandant, CISF Unit, DVC Panchet, PO & PS. DVC Panchet, District: Dhanbad, Jharkhand,
7. The Commandant, CISF Unit, NSCBIA, Kolkata, PO & PS: NSCBIA, Kolkata (W.B). Appellants

Versus

Ravindra Kaur, wife of Late Baldev Singh, resident of House No. AS-VI/23 Kalyanpur Housing, PO & PS: Asansol (North), District: Burdwan (W.B.)-713 305 Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Appellants : Mr. Prashant Pallav, ASGI
 Ms. Shivani Jaluka, A.C. to ASGI
For the Respondent : Mr. Amit Kumar Das, Advocate.
 Mr. Shivam Utkarsh Sahay, Advocate

04/Dated:19.01.2026

I.A. No. 3465 of 2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. There is a 155-day delay in instituting this appeal.
3. We have perused the averments in the interim application. The delay has been properly explained, and the explanation constitutes sufficient cause. The reasons for the delay have been set out in paragraphs 7 to 18, and all such reasons constitute sufficient cause. Even the delay is not inordinate.

4. Therefore, delay of 155 days in filing this appeal is hereby, condoned. I.A. No. 3465 of 2025 is disposed of.

L.P.A. No. 399 of 2025

5. By a separate order, we have condoned the delay. With the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, we take up the appeal for admission and/or interim reliefs.

6. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, we note that the respondent, who was dismissed from service, is the widow of a Martyr, who lost his life in Jammu & Kashmir. The record shows that the respondent was offered a compassionate appointment and, while serving, was subjected to sexual harassment on at least two occasions. We say so because one of the perpetrators was found guilty of indulging in such harassment.

7. After that, the respondent was proceeded against departmentally on the allegation of insubordination involving the snatching of the I-card of her superior officer at the Kolkata Airport. The learned Single Judge has found several infirmities in the enquiry proceedings, including that the copy of the enquiry report was not furnished to the respondent. Besides, the learned Single Judge has noted the penalty of dismissal from service was grossly disproportionate and shocking.

8. By the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has remitted the matter to the disciplinary authority to pass a fresh order on the quantum of punishment, except the punishment of removal, dismissal, termination and compulsory retirement. The direction has

also been issued to reinstate the respondent in service with full back wages.

9. The learned counsel for the respondent points out that the respondent, besides being Martyr's widow, has to look after their minor daughter.

10. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the learned Single Judge's impugned order is vulnerable on several grounds. He submitted that the copy of the enquiry report was, in fact, dispatched to the respondent, but she refused to accept the same. He pointed out that necessary entries have also been made in the prescribed registers to record this. He submitted that if full back wages are to be granted, the same will further restrict the disciplinary authority's scope in the matter of imposing a penalty. He submitted that C.I.S.F. is a disciplined force and therefore, the standards of discipline expected of the members of this force are substantially higher. He submitted that this aspect has not been appropriately considered in the impugned order.

11. Learned counsel for the respondent points out that the officer who was found guilty of sexually harassing the respondent has been retained in service after imposing the penalty of withholding of three increments.

12. Considering the above, by way of interim relief, we direct the appellants to deposit 50 per cent of the back wages in this Court within four weeks from today. Besides, we also direct the disciplinary authority to reconsider the issue of punishment as directed by the

impugned order within this period of four weeks and place its decision before this Court.

13. We list this appeal to consider its admission and/or passing of any further interim reliefs, if necessary, on 23rd February, 2026. By this date, 50 per cent of the back wages must be deposited in this Court, and the decision on the issue of any penalty to be imposed upon the respondent must be placed before this Court.

14. This matter is to stand over to 23rd February, 2026.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

19.01.2026

APK/VK