IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR WRIT APPEAL NO. 49 / 2014

APPELLANT PETITIONER

Dilip Hedau, son of Shri Hatiram Hedau, aged about 53 years, presently posted as Manager, Hastshilp Vikas Nigam, Banglapara, Uttar Chakradhar Nagar, Raigarh, Thana and Post Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

Presented by Child And Andrew VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

- State of Chhattisgarh through the

 (a) Principal Secretary, Department of General Administration, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Thana Mandir Hasod, Post Office Mandir Hasod, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
 - (b) Principal Secretary, Department of Gramoudyog, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Thana Mandir Hasod, Post Office Mandir Hasod, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 2. Chhattisgarh Hastshilp Vikas Nigam, through its Managing Director, Chhattisgarh Haat Campus, Opposite Mahalakshmi Cloth Market, Thana Pandri, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

BPS Network Co-ordinated, Same Administration of C-116

Andrea Grand Hoor Bound High Complex, New Regarders

APPEAL TO DIVISION BENCH UNDER SECTION 2(1) OF THE Nages, Review, CAS

CHATTISGARH HIGH COURT (APPEAL TO DIVISION BENCH) ACT

2006 READ WITH RULE 158(10) OF THE CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT

RULES 2007





IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR DIVISION BENCH

HON'BLE MR. T.P. SHARMA, & HON'BLE MR. I.S. UBOWEJA, JJ

W.A.No. 479 of 2014

Appellant Petitioner

Dilip Hedau

versus

Respondents

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

Appeal to Division Bench under Section 2 (1) of the Chhattisgarh High Court (Appeal to Division Bench) Act, 2006

Appearance:

Mr. Amrito Das, counsel for the appellant.

Mr. Prafull N. Bharat, Additional Advocate General

for the State/respondents No. 1(a) and 1 (b).

Mr. Ali Asgar, counsel for the respondents No. 2 and 3.

OR DER (24.12.2014)

T.P. Sharma, J

- The appellant has preferred this appeal against the order dated 24.11.2014 passed in W.P(S) No.2492/2013, whereby the learned Single Judge, has dismissed the W.P. (S)No.2492/2013 along with other W.P.(S)No.1180/2013.
- Heard learned counsel for the parties and order impugned perused.
- 3. By the order impugned, the writ Court has only refrained itself from quashing the order dated 08.05.2013, whereby respondent has directed for initiation of departmental enquiry against the appellant. Departmental enquiry is a fact finding

procedure to ensure whether an employee has committed



misconduct or not, therefore, by dismissing the writ petition, the learned Single Judge has not committed any illegality. We do not find any substance in the writ appeal.

 Consequently, the writ appeal is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed at the stage of admission itself. No order asto costs.

> Sd/-T.P. Sharma Judge

Sd/-Inder Singh Uboweja Judge

Vijay