



2026:CGHC:19584

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### WPS No. 4093 of 2022

- Akram Khan S/o Shri Ismail Khan Aged About 36 Years Ex-Driver  
Family Court Janjgir-Champa R/o Qr. D-17, Deepti Vihar Colony  
Janjgir, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

... **Petitioner(s)**

**versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Principal Secretary, Law And  
Legislature Affairs Dptt. Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya  
Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Registrar General High Court Of Chhattisgarh Bilaspur,  
Chhattisgarh
3. Judge, Family Court Janjgir, District : Janjgir-Champa,  
Chhattisgarh

... **Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. B.P. Rao, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Vinay Pandey, Dy. A.G.
For Respondents No. 2 and 3	:	Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, Advocate

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**

**Judgment On Board**

**28.4.2026**

- 1) By way of this petition, petitioner has sought following reliefs:-

10.1 That, the Hon'ble Court be pleased to call for entire records from the Respondents for its kind perusal and to decide the instant



Writ Petition.

10.2 That, the Hon'ble Court be please to expunge the impugned Annual Confidential Reports of the Petitioner for the period of 18.7.2019 to 31.3.2020 & 1.4.2020 to 31.8.2020 (Annexure P-9) & Annual Confidential Report of the Petitioner for the period from 1.9.2020 to 6.1.2021 (Annexure P-10) in the interest of justice.

10.3 Any other Order or directions deem fit and proper may also be granted in the interest of justice.

- 2)** Mr. B.P. Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially petitioner was appointed to the post of Driver in Family Court, Janjgir vide order dated 20.2.2010 and his services were regularized vide order dated 23.5.2012. He further submits that in the ACRs of years 2012 to 2019, petitioner was graded 'Good' and 'Very Good' remarks but in the ACRs of years 2020 and 2021, petitioner has been awarded 'Poor' remark by the Judge, Family Court, Janjgir without assigning any sufficient reason. He contends that those ACRs were not communicated to the petitioner and same were obtained by him under RTI Act, 2005, therefore he could not make representation before the respondent authorities seeking upgradation of ACRs of years 2020 and 2021. He further contends that petitioner may be permitted to make a representation before the competent authority seeking upgradation of ACRs of years 2020 and 2021.
- 3)** On the other hand, Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, learned counsel for the respondents No. 2 and 3 submits that petitioner has not



averred in the writ petition that ACRs of years 2020 and 2021 were not communicated to him by the reporting authority and for the first time this issue has been raised during the course of argument. He further submits that services of petitioner were terminated and subsequently he was re-instated in service vide order dated 17.11.2022. He contends that remarks mentioned in the ACRs of years 2020 and 2021 were recorded looking to the conduct, behaviour and integrity of the petitioner and no case is made out for interference.

- 4) Mr. Vinay Pandey, learned State counsel would support the contention made by Mr. Bhaduri.
- 5) I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
- 6) Perusal of ACRs of years 2020 and 2021 would make it clear that those ACRs were obtained by the petitioner under RTI Act, 2005, thus it is very much clear that ACRs of years 2020 and 2021 were not communicated to the petitioner. However, Mr. Rao has made a prayer seeking permission to make a representation before the competent authority.
- 7) In my opinion, such prayer appears to be reasonable. Accordingly, this petition is hereby being disposed reserving liberty in favor of the petitioner to prefer a detailed representation before the Registrar General, High Court Of Chhattisgarh seeking upgradation of remarks in ACRs of years 2020 and 2021 within



2026:CGHC:19584

period of 30 days from today. The authority concerned is directed to consider and decide such representation strictly in accordance with law, preferably within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of the same.

**8)** With the aforesaid direction, this petition stands **disposed**. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

**Sd/-**  
**(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)**  
JUDGE

Ajinkya