IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No. 25982 of 2021

In the matter of an application under Articles 226 & 227 of the Constitution of India.

.....

Karambir Singh .... ***Petitioner***

-versus-

Union of India & Ors. .... ***Opposite Parties***

For Petitioner : Ms. Sagarika Sahoo, Advocate

For Opp. Parties : Mr. P.K. Parhi, Deputy Solicitor General of India along with Ms. S. Patra, Central Govt. Counsel

PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

Date of Hearing: 21.01.2026 & Date of Judgment: 06.03.2026

Biraja Prasanna Satapathy, J.

The present writ petition has been filed inter alia challenging the order of punishment passed against the Petitioner in a

proceeding initiated under Rule 36 of the CISF Rules, 2001 vide charge memo dtd.12.01.2020.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended that Petitioner while in service as Head Constable under CISF and posted at Rourkela Steel Plant, Rourkela, the proceeding in question was initiated against him vide charge memo dtd.12.01.2020. In the said proceeding, Petitioner filed his reply and also participated in the enquiry. But the enquiry officer without conducting the enquiry in accordance with law, held the Petitioner guilty of the charges vide his report dt.06.06.2020 under Annexure-3. Petitioner on being communicated with the report along with the show-cause, submitted his reply on 17.06.2020. But without proper appreciation of the same, Petitioner was imposed with the following punishment vide order dtd.30.06.2020:-

> *"Reduction of pay by 3 stages from Rs.41,600/- to Rs. 38,100/- for a period of 3 years in the pay level (matrix) 05 with immediate effect. It is further directed that he will not earn increment of pay during the period of reduction and on expiry of period reduction will have the effect on postponing his future increment of pay."*

2.1. It is contended that challenging such order of punishment passed by the disciplinary authority-Opp. Party No. 4 on 30.06.2020, Petitioner moved the appellate authority-Opp. Party No. 3. But the appellate authority without proper appreciation of the grounds of appeal, rejected the same by upholding the order of punishment vide order dtd.28.08.2020 under Annexure-4. Even though Petitioner preferred a revision under Anneure-5, but the revisional authority as like the appellate authority without proper appreciation of the grounds taken in the revision, rejected the same vide order dtd.20.04.2021 under Annexure-1.

2.2. While assailing the impugned order of punishment so passed by Opp. Party No. 4 on 30.04.2020, confirmed by the appellate authority-Opp. Party No. 3 vide order dtd.28.08.2020 and further confirmed by the revisional authority-Opp. Party No. 2 vide order dtd.20.04.2021 under Annexure-1, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended that the proceeding has been disposed of without following the principle of natural justice and the disciplinary authority held the Petitioner guilty of the charges with imposition of the punishment solely relying on the statement of one B.C. Majhi, who was arrested pursuant to registration of Tangarpali P.S. Case No. 01 of 2020

corresponding to G.R. Case No. 06 of 2020 pending before the learned JMFC, Rural Rourkela.

2.3. It is also contended that if the CCTV footage of the entire incident will be looked into by this Court, Petitioner will not be held guilty at all and the punishment so imposed in the proceeding will not hold good. It is further contended that even though Petitioner made an application to get the CCTV footage of the alleged incident, but the same was never provided to him. It is further contended that since the CCTV footage was taken into consideration by the enquiry officer without providing a copy thereof to the Petitioner, such amounts to non-compliance of the provisions contained under Rule 36(16) of the 2001 Rules.

2.4. It is also contended that since the F.I.R. was lodged after around 8 days of the alleged occurrence and thereafter the proceeding with the charge memo dtd.12.01.2020 was initiated, taking into account the stand taken by the Petitioner in his reply and the materials available during enquiry, Petitioner could not have been held guilty of the charges by the enquiry officer and consequentially by the disciplinary authority with imposition of the punishment vide order dtd.30.06.2020.

2.5. It is contended that since principle of natural justice was never followed and on the face of the application made by the Petitioner, he was not provided with the CCTV footage, which was relied on by the enquiry officer, imposition of the punishment vide order dtd.30.06.2020 of Opp. Party No. 4 so confirmed by the appellate authority vide order dtd.28.08.2020 under Annexure-4 and by the revisional authority vide order dtd.20.04.2021 under Annexure-1 needs interference of this Court. In support of his submissions, reliance was placed to the following decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court:

> (***i) Moni Shankar Vs. Union of India & Anr., (2008) 3 SCC 484***
>
> ***(ii) State of U.P. Vs. Shatrughan Lal & Anr., (1998) 6 SCC 651***
>
> ***(iii) Chandrama Tewar Vs. Union of India (Through General Manager, Eastern Railways), 1987 SCC 518***
>
> ***(iv) Union of India & Anr. Vs. S.K. Kapoor, (2011) 4 SCC 589***
>
> ***(v) State of Uttar Pradesh through Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Lucknow vs. Ram Prakash Singh, 2925 SCC OnLine SC 891***

2.6. Hon'ble Apex Court in Para 17 & 18 of the Judgment in the case of ***Moni Shankar*** has held as follows:-

> *"**17.** The departmental proceeding is a quasi-judicial one. Although the provisions of the Evidence Act are not applicable in the said proceeding, principles of natural justice are required to be complied with. The courts exercising power of judicial review are entitled to consider as to whether while inferring commission of misconduct on the part of a delinquent officer relevant piece of evidence has been taken into consideration and irrelevant facts have been excluded therefrom. Inference on facts must be based on evidence which meet the requirements of legal principles. The Tribunal was, thus, entitled to arrive at its own conclusion on the premise that the evidence adduced by the Department, even if it is taken on its face value to be correct in its entirety, meet the requirements of burden of proof, namely, preponderance of probability. If on such evidences, the test of the doctrine of proportionality has not been satisfied, the Tribunal was within its domain to interfere. We must place on record that the doctrine of unreasonableness is giving way to the doctrine of proportionality. (See State of U.P. v. Sheo Shanker Lal Srivastava [(2006) 3 SCC 276 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 521] and Coimbatore District Central Coop. Bank v. Employees Assn. [(2007) 4 SCC 669 : (2007) 2 SCC (L&S) 68])*
>
> ***18.** We must also place on record that on certain aspects even judicial review of fact is permissible. (E v. Secy. of State for the Home Deptt. [2004 QB 1044 : (2004) 2 WLR 1351 (CA)])"*

2.7. Similarly, Hon'ble Apex Court in Para 4, 6 & 9 of the judgment in the case of ***Shatrughan Lal*** has held as follows:-

> *"**4.** Now, one of the principles of natural justice is that a person against whom an action is proposed to be taken has to be given an opportunity of hearing. This opportunity has to be an effective opportunity and not a mere pretence. In departmental proceedings where charge-sheet is issued and the documents which are proposed to be utilised against that person are indicated in the charge-sheet but copies thereof are not supplied to him in spite of his request, and he is, at*

the same time, called upon to submit his reply, it cannot be said that an effective opportunity to defend was provided to him. (See: Chandrama Tewari v. Union of India [1987 Supp SCC 518 : 1988 SCC (L&S) 226 : (1987) 5 ATC 369 : AIR 1988 SC 117] ; Kashinath Dikshita v. Union of India [(1986) 3 SCC 229 : 1986 SCC (L&S) 502 : (1986) 1 ATC 176 : AIR 1986 SC 2118] ; State of U.P. v. Mohd. Sharif [(1982) 2 SCC 376 : 1982 SCC (L&S) 253 : AIR 1982 SC 937] .)

xxx xxx xxx

***6.** Preliminary enquiry which is conducted invariably on the back of the delinquent employee may often constitute the whole basis of the charge-sheet. Before a person is, therefore, called upon to submit his reply to the charge-sheet, he must, on a request made by him in that behalf, be supplied the copies of the statements of witnesses recorded during the preliminary enquiry particularly if those witnesses are proposed to be examined at the departmental trial. This principle was reiterated in Kashinath Dikshita v. Union of India [(1986) 3 SCC 229 : 1986 SCC (L&S) 502 : (1986) 1 ATC 176 : AIR 1986 SC 2118] wherein it was also laid down that this lapse would vitiate the departmental proceedings unless it was shown and established as a fact that non-supply of copies of those documents had not caused any prejudice to the delinquent in his defence.*

xxx xxx xxx

***9.** This paragraph of the written statement contains an admission of the appellant that copies of the documents specified in the charge-sheet were not supplied to the respondent as the respondent had every right to inspect them at any time. This assertion clearly indicates that although it is admitted that the copies of the documents were not supplied to the respondent and although he had the right to inspect those documents, neither were the copies given to him nor were the records made available to him for inspection. If the appellant did not intend to give the copies of the documents to the respondent, it should have been indicated to the respondent in writing that he may inspect those documents. Merely saying that the respondent could have inspected the documents at any time is not enough. He has to be informed that the documents of which the copies were asked for by him may be inspected. The access to record must be assured to him."*

2.8. Hon'ble Apex Court, in Para 4 & 9 of the judgment in the case of ***Chandrama Tewari*** has held as follows:-

> *"**4.** We have given our anxious consideration to the submissions made on behalf of the appellant and we have further considered the aforesaid authorities referred to by the learned counsel for the appellant but we do not find any merit in the appellant's submissions to justify interference with the High Court's judgment. Article 311 of the Constitution requires that reasonable opportunity of defence must be afforded to a government servant before he is awarded major punishment of dismissal. It further contemplates that disciplinary enquiry must be held in accordance with the rules in a just and fair manner. The procedure at the enquiry must be consistent with the principles of natural justice. Principles of natural justice require that the copy of the document if any relied upon against the party charged should be given to him and he should be afforded opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses and to produce his own witnesses in his defence. If findings are recorded against the government servant placing reliance on a document which may not have been disclosed to him or the copy whereof may not have been supplied to him during the enquiry when demanded, that would contravene principles of natural justice rendering the enquiry, and the consequential order of punishment illegal and void. These principles are well settled by a catena of decisions of this Court. We need not refer to them. However, it is not necessary that each and every document must be supplied to the delinquent government servant facing the charges, instead only material and relevant documents are necessary to be supplied to him. If a document even though mentioned in the memo of charges is not relevant to the charges or if it is not referred to or relied upon by the enquiry officer or the punishing authority in holding the charges proved against the government servant, no exception can be taken to the validity of the proceedings or the order. If the document is not used against the party charged the ground of violation of principles of natural justice cannot successfully be raised. The violation of principles of natural justice arises only when a document, copy of which may not have been supplied to the party charged when demanded is used in recording finding of guilt against him. On a careful consideration of the authorities cited on behalf of the appellant we find that the obligation to supply copies of a document is confined only to material and relevant documents and the enquiry would be vitiated only if*

the non-supply of material and relevant documents when demanded may have caused prejudice to the delinquent officer.

xxx *xxx* *xxx*

9. *It is now well settled that if copies of relevant and material documents including the statement of witnesses recorded in the preliminary enquiry or during investigation are not supplied to the delinquent officer facing the enquiry and if such documents are relied in holding the charges framed against the officer, the enquiry would be vitiated for the violation of principles of natural justice. Similarly, if the statement of witnesses recorded during the investigation of a criminal case or in the preliminary enquiry is not supplied to the delinquent officer that would amount to denial of opportunity of effective cross-examination. It is difficult to comprehend exhaustively the facts and circumstances which may lead to violation of principles of natural justice or denial of reasonable opportunity of defence. This question must be determined on the facts and circumstances of each case. While considering this question it has to be borne in mind that a delinquent officer is entitled to have copies of material and relevant documents only which may include the copy of statement of witnesses recorded during the investigation or preliminary enquiry or the copy of any other document which may have been relied on in support of the charges. If a document has no bearing on the charges or if it is not relied on by the enquiry officer to support the charges, or if such document or material was not necessary for the cross-examination of witnesses during the enquiry, the officer cannot insist upon the supply of copies of such documents, as the absence of copy of such document will not prejudice the delinquent officer. The decision of the question whether a document is material or not will depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case."*

2.9. Hon'ble Apex Court in Para 5 of the judgment in the case of ***S.K. Kapoor*** has held as follows:-

*"**5.** It is a settled principle of natural justice that if any material is to be relied upon in departmental proceedings, a copy of the same must be supplied in advance to the charge-sheeted employee so that he may have a chance to rebut the same."*

2.10. Hon'ble Apex Court in Para 14 & 33 of the judgment in the case of ***Ram Prakash Singh*** has held as follows:-

> *"**14.** What follows from a conjoint reading of the above two decisions is and what applies here is that, 'materials brought on record by the parties' (to which consideration in the enquiry ought to be confined) mean only such materials can be considered which are brought on record in a manner known to law. Such materials can then be considered legal evidence, which can be acted upon. Though the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 is not strictly applicable to departmental enquiries, which are not judicial proceedings, nevertheless, the principles flowing therefrom can be applied in specific cases. Evidence tendered by witnesses must be recorded in the presence of the delinquent employee, he should be given opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses and no document should be relied on by the prosecution without giving copy thereof to the delinquent - all these basic principles of fair play have their root in such Act. In such light, the documents referred to in the list of documents forming part of the annexures to the chargesheet, on which the department seeks to rely in the enquiry, cannot be treated as legal evidence worthy of forming the basis for a finding of guilt if the contents of such documents are not spoken to by persons competent to speak about them. A document does not prove itself. In the enquiry, therefore, the contents of the relied-on documents have to be proved by examining a witness having knowledge of the contents of such document and who can depose as regards its authenticity. In the present case, no such exercise was undertaken by producing any witness.*
>
> *xxx xxx xxx*
>
> ***33.** Resting on the aforesaid reasoning, the answer to the basic question (majority view) in B. Karunakar (supra) is found in paragraph 29 reading as follows:*
>
> *"**29.** Hence it has to be held that when the enquiry officer is not the disciplinary authority, the delinquent employee has a right to receive a copy of the enquiry officer's report before the disciplinary authority arrives at its conclusions with regard to the guilt or innocence of the employee with regard to the charges levelled against him. That right is a part of the*

employee's right to defend himself against the charges levelled against him. A denial of the enquiry officer's report before the disciplinary authority takes its decision on the charges, is a denial of reasonable opportunity to the employee to prove his innocence and is a breach of the principles of natural justice.""

3. Mr. P.K. Parhi, learned DSGI on the other hand made his submission basing on the stand taken in the counter affidavit so filed. Learned DSGI contended that Petitioner while in duty as a Head Constable in RSP Rourkela on 25.12.2019, Petitioner was posted in the Traffic Gate in day shift (08.00 hours to 19.30 hours) of Rourkela Steel Plant, Rourkela to ensure proper access, control, security and physical checking of vehicles. But during his duty period, two vehicles entered the plant premises at about 11.44 hours without physical checking and documentation.

3.1. Those vehicles when tried to load slab with the help of an unidentified crane operator and the same came to the knowledge of the official of the Rourkela Steel Plant, an F.I.R. was lodged by the Inspector, CISF Unit RSP, against the driver and helper of both the vehicles giving rise to Tangarpali P.S. Case No. 01 of 2020 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 06 of 2020. Because of such negligence in duty on 25.12.2019, Petitioner was placed under

suspension vide order dtd.26.12.2019 and the proceeding was initiated vide charge memo dtd.12.01.2020 under Rule 36 of the 2001 Rules.

3.2. Learned DSGI also contended that in the proceeding in question, Petitioner submitted his reply on 19.01.2020 by denying all the charges. But the enquiry officer after conducting the enquiry, submitted the report to the disciplinary authority-Opp. Party No. 4 on 06.06.2020 by holding the Petitioner guilty of the charges.

3.3. It is contended that after receipt of the enquiry report, Petitioner was issued with the show-cause and after filing of the reply to the show-cause, the disciplinary authority imposed the punishment vide order dtd.30.06.2020. Even though Petitioner moved the appellate authority as well as the revisional authority by filing the appeal and revision against such order of punishment, but such appeal and revision filed by the Petitioner was rejected by the appellate authority vide order under Annexure-4 and by the revisional authority vide order under Annexure-1.

3.4. It is contended that since the order of punishment so passed against the Petitioner by the disciplinary authority has been confirmed by the appellate authority as well as revisional authority, in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India***

& Ors. Vs. P. Gunasekaran, no interference is called for. It is contended that Hon'ble Apex Court in the said reported decision held that in disciplinary proceeding matters, the High Court is not and cannot act as a second court of first appeal. The High Court, in exercise of the powers under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, shall not venture into re-appreciation of the evidence. The High Court only can see whether:-

> *a. the enquiry is held by a competent authority,*
>
> *b. the enquiry is held according to the procedure prescribed in that behalf,*
>
> *c. there is violation of the principle of natural justice in conducting the proceedings;*
>
> *d. the authorities have disabled themselves from reaching a fair conclusion.*

3.5. View expressed by the Hon'ble Apex Curt in the aforesaid reported decision reads as follows:-

> *"Despite the well-settled position, it is painfully disturbing to note that the High Court has acted as an appellate authority in the disciplinary proceedings, re-appreciating even the evidence before the enquiry officer. The finding on Charge no. I was accepted by the disciplinary authority and was also endorsed by the Central Administrative Tribunal. In disciplinary proceedings, the High Court is not and cannot act as a second court of first appeal. The High Court, in exercise of its powers*

under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, shall not venture into re- appreciation of the evidence. The High Court can only see whether:

a. the enquiry is held by a competent authority;

b. behalf; the enquiry is held according to the procedure prescribed in that

C. there is violation of the principles of natural justice in conducting the proceedings;

d. the authorities have disabled themselves from reaching a fair

conclusion by some considerations extraneous to the evidence and merits of the case;

e. the authorities have allowed themselves to be influenced by irrelevant or extraneous considerations;

f. the conclusion, on the very face of it, is so wholly arbitrary and capricious that no reasonable person could ever have arrived at such conclusion;

g. the disciplinary authority had erroneously failed to admit the admissible and material evidence;

h. the disciplinary authority had erroneously admitted inadmissible evidence which influenced the finding;

i. the finding of fact is based on no evidence.

3.6. It is also contended that since because of the negligence on the part of the Petitioner while in duty on 25.12.2019, two vehicles entered into the plant premises and loaded slab without physical

checking and documentation, the said misconduct of the Petitioner is not only serious but also violative of the conduct of service Rules. It is also contended that Petitioner all through in the proceeding was provided with opportunity of hearing and there is no allegation that principle of natural justice has not been followed. Making all these submissions, learned DSGI contended that no illegality or irregularity has been committed by the Opp. Parties in imposing the punishment in the proceeding initiated on 12.01.2020.

4. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties and considering the submission made, this Court finds that Petitioner while being posted as Head Constable in RSP Rourkela, he was on duty in the morning shift from 8.00 hours to 19.30 hours on 25.12.2019. With the allegation that two vehicles entered the plant premises at about 11.34 hours without physical checking and documentation, F.I.R. was lodged by the Inspector, CISF Unit, RSP Rourkela against the driver and helper of both the vehicles giving rise to Tangarpali P.S. Case No. 01 of 2020 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 06 of 2020 in the file of learned JMFC, Rural Rourkela. Because of such negligence in duty, Petitioner was placed under suspension

vide order dtd.26.12.2019 and thereafter the proceeding was initiated vide charge memo dtd.12.01.2020 under Annexure-1/A.

4.1 Petitioner filed his reply to the charges on 19.01.2020 and the enquiry officer after conducting the enquiry, submitted the report under Annexure-1/B. Finding of the enquiry officer reads as follows:-

> *"In the above case after taking into consideration the statement of prosecution witness, court witness and defense statement as well as prosecution exhibit produced by PWs and circumstantial evidence prevailed at the time, the Inquiry Officer came into conclusion that article of charge -1 framed against the Charged Official HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U / S) of CISF Unit RSP Rourkela is established from the deposition of PW-1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 & 18 and documentary exhibits produced as PW-1/Exh.2, 3, 4 & 5, PW-2/Exh.2 & 3, PW-3/Exh.1, 2 & 3, PW-6/Exh.1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6, PW-8/Exh.1 &2, PW-13/Exh.1, PW-14/Exh.1 & 2 and PW-17/Exh.1, 2, 3 & 4 that on 25.12.2019 during the operation of traffic gate HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U / S) was deployed in general shift from 0800 to 1930 hrs at vehicle entry (physical check) duty post. The said MOF was assigned duty to check physical verification of the vehicles coming inside RSP through traffic gate. On 25.12.2019 aforesaid two vehicles entered inside the plant premises without any physical and security check and valid document which were caught at new plate mill weighbridge. The above act on the part of Charged Official HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U / S) denotes gross negligence, misconduct and indifference towards his bonafide duty. Hence, Article of Charge No.1 framed against*

No.902335806 HC(GD) Karambir Singh is PROVED beyond any doubt.

02 With regard to Article of charge no.2 framed against No.902335806 HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U / S) of CISF Unit RSP Rourkela it has been established from the deposition of PW-1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 & 17 as well as documentary evidence/exhibits produced as PW-I/Exh.1, 2, 3, 4 & 5, PW-2/Exh.2, 3 & 4, PW-3/Exh.1, 2 & 3, PW-6/Exh.1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6, PW-8/Exh.1 & 2, PW-13/Exh.1, PW-14/Exh.1 & 2 and PW-17/Exh.1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 that on 25.12.2019 No.902335806 HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U / S) was deployed in general shift from 0800 hrs to 1930 hrs at traffic gate and he was assigned duty of vehicle entry (physical check). During his duty 02 vehicles Trailer bearing Regd. No.CG-04ZE-7285 and Truck bearing Regd. No.NL-02Q-1336 had got entered in the plant premises through traffic gate which were caught at new plate mill. The aforesaid two vehicles was in the process of loading slab from slab yard at new plate mill inside RSP and HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U / S) did not check the physical and security as well relevant documents of the vehicles and with active connivance he involved in malpractice with an intention to steal the Govt. property. The above act on the part of HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U/S) shows act of indiscipline, misconduct, hatching conspiracy and involved in misappropriation of Govt. property which has tarnish the image of force. Hence, Article of Charge No.2 framed against No.902335806 HC(GD) Karambir Singh is PROVED beyond any iota of doubt.

03. With regard to article of charge No.3 framed against No.902335806 HC(GD) Karambir Singh (U/S) of CISF Unit RSP Rourkela vide charge memorandum No.V-15014/02-20/CISF/L&R/RSP/Karambir Singh/2020/80 dated 12.01.2020 it

has been established from the statement of CW-1 and exhibit produced by him as CW-1/Exh.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 that after affording reasonable opportunity the Charged Official HC(GD) Karambir Singh has failed to amend his conduct and he is having 07 minor penalties in the past. The plea taken by the Charged Official that his performance has been assessed as outstanding, the same does not justify the serious act of misconduct committed by him. Hence, the above episode on the part of Charged Official denotes act of indiscipline and misconduct which is not expected from a member of disciplined force. Hence, Article of Charge No.3 framed against No.902335806 HC(GD) Karambir Singh is PROVED beyond any iota of doubt."

4.2. On the face of such enquiry report, Petitioner was issued with the show-cause and after receipt of the reply, Opp. Party No. 4 being the disciplinary authority while disposing the proceeding, imposed the punishment vide order dtd.30.06.2020 under Annexure-1/C. Order passed by the disciplinary authority-Opp. Party No. 4 has been confirmed by the appellate authority as well as by the revisional authority vide orders issued under Annexure-4 and 1 respectively.

4.3. This Court after going through the materials available on record, is of the view that the proceeding has been conducted strictly in accordance with the provisions contained under Rule 36 of CISF Rules, 2001 and Petitioner has been provided with due opportunity of hearing all through. Taking into account the seriousness of the charges

and the decision in the case of ***P. Gunasekaraan*** (as cited supra) and the fact that two of the vehicles entered into plant premises without proper checking and documentation while Petitioner was on duty on 25.12.2019 and tried to load slabs unauthorisedly, which is not disputed, this Court finds no illegality or irregularity with the impugned order of punishment so passed on 30.06.2020 under Annexure-1/C, confirmed vide order under Annexure-4 and 1 respectively.

4.4. This Court is unable to accept the contention raised by the Petitioner that he was prejudiced due to non-supply of the CCTV footage of the incident. It is also the view of this Court that the decisions relied on by the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner is not applicable to the facts of the present case.

4.5. In that view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order of punishment so passed against the Petitioner and subject matter of challenge in the writ petition. While not inclined to interfere with the order of punishment so passed by Opp. Party No. 4 vide order dt.30.06.2020 and confirmed by the Appellate Authority-Opp. Party No. 3 vide order dt.28.08.2020 under Annexure-4 and by the Revisional Authority-Opp. Party No. 2 vide

order dt.20.04.2021 under Annexure-1, this Court dismiss the writ petition.

5. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY)
Judge

Orissa High Court, Cuttack
Dated the 6th March, 2026/Sneha