



2026:CGHC:19707

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 3596 of 2022**

- Gajanand Gajendra S/o Shivdayal Gajendra Aged About 77 Years Working As Assistant Teacher, Government Higher Secondary School Barhi, District - Balod, Chhattisgarh., District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralay, New Raipur, Atal Nagar Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. District Education Officer Balod, District - Balod, Chhattisgarh., District : Balod, Chhattisgarh
3. The Principal Government Higher Secondary School Barhi, District - Balod, Chhattisgarh., District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner : Ms. Swati Rani Saraf, Advocate

For State : Mr. Abhishek Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**Order on Board****28.4.2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking the following relief(s):-

I. This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the impugned order dated 22.04.2022 against the petitioner, and petitioner may be reinstated, in the interest of justice,



II. Any other relief/order which may deem fit and just in the facts and circumstances of the case including award of the costs of the petition may be given.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was appointed to the post of Shiksha Karmi Grade- III vide order dated 29.6.2007 on the basis of mark-sheet of D.Ed. Later on, the services of the petitioner were regularized on 25.9.2009. Subsequently, his services were merged with the School Education Department vide order dated 10.08.2018. He would further submit that on 31.3.2022, a show cause notice was issued, wherein it was stated that the petitioner had submitted a forged mark sheet of D.Ed. to secure appointment. The petitioner filed a reply to the show cause notice and the services of the petitioner were terminated vide order dated 20.4.2022. He would contend that the petitioner was a civil servant, and the penalty of termination was inflicted without following the prescribed rules, whereas the respondent authorities were under obligation to conduct an inquiry in accordance with Rule 14 of the CCA Rules, 1966; thus, the order of termination of services and the subsequent order passed in appeal are bad in law and liable to be quashed.
3. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose.
4. The services of the petitioner have been terminated on the ground that he submitted forged mark sheet to secure a government job. It is also apparent from the record that no steps were taken by the



Department to examine the veracity of the mark sheets which were submitted by the petitioner along with the application form.

5. It is also not in dispute that the services of the petitioner were absorbed in the School Education Department, and he acquired the status of a civil servant, therefore, the impugned order dated 20.4.2022 is not sustainable, as the disciplinary authority was required to apply the provisions contained in Rule 14 of the CCA Rules, 1966, and was under an obligation to conduct an inquiry in accordance with the said rules.
6. Taking into consideration the above-discussed facts, the order dated 20.4.2022 are hereby **quashed**.
7. However, the respondent authorities would be at liberty to initiate fresh inquiry strictly in accordance with the CCA Rules, 1966. The entire exercise shall be completed by the respondent authorities within a period of 90 days. In case, upon inquiry, the petitioner is found innocent, he shall be entitled to all consequential benefits attached to the post from the date of termination accordingly.
8. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this writ petition is hereby **disposed of**. No order as to cost.

Sd/-
Rakesh Mohan Pandey
JUDGE