



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1269/2025

Sushila Devi Jatav W/o Sh. Lokesh Gupta, aged about 59 Years,
R/o Bhertri Colony, Near Bus Stand, Bayana, Bharatpur (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Rajasthan, through its Secretary, Department of Integrated, Child Development Service (Mahila and Bal Vikas Department) Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan Jaipur.
3. Director Integrated, Child Development Service, (Mahila and Bal Vikas Department) Rajasthan, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Tarun Jaiman
For Respondent(s)	:	

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

05/02/2025

1. A limited prayer has been made by counsel for the petitioner for issuing a direction to the respondents to conclude the disciplinary proceedings expeditiously, preferably within a time frame as the petitioner is going to retire on 31.03.2025.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that a charge-sheet under Rule 16 of the Rajasthan Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1958 (for short, 'the Rules of 1958') was served upon the petitioner at the fag end of his career i.e. on 04.09.2024. Counsel submits that reply to the aforesaid charge-sheet has already been served in the office of Disciplinary Authority but the



enquiry is proceeding at a snail's pace, therefore appropriate direction be issued to the authorities to expedite the departmental proceedings.

3. In the case of **Prem Nath Bali Vs. Registrar, High Court of Delhi and Ors.**, reported in **AIR 2016 SC 101**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has emphasized that it is the duty of the employer to ensure that the departmental inquiry initiated against the delinquent employee is concluded within the shortest possible time by taking priority measures. In cases where the delinquent is placed under suspension during the pendency of such inquiry then it becomes all the more imperative for the employer to ensure that the inquiry is concluded in the shortest possible time to avoid any inconvenience, loss and prejudice to the rights of the delinquent employee.

4. As a matter of experience, this Court notice that after completion of the inquiry, the issue involved therein does not come to an end because if the findings of the inquiry proceedings have gone against the delinquent employee, he invariably pursues the issue in Court to ventilate his grievance, which again consumes time for its final conclusion.

5. Keeping these factors in mind, this Court is of the considered opinion that every employer (whether State or private) must make sincere endeavor to conclude the departmental inquiry proceedings once initiated against the delinquent employee within a reasonable time by giving priority to such proceedings and as far as possible it should be concluded within six months as an outer limit. Where it is not possible for the employer to conclude due to certain unavoidable causes arising in the proceedings within the





[CW-1269/2025]

time frame then efforts should be made to conclude within reasonably extended period depending upon the cause and the nature of inquiry.

6. Looking to the limited prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner and also looking to the fact that petitioner is going to retire on 31.03.2025, the instant writ petition stands disposed of by issuing a direction to the respondents to speed up the proceedings of the domestic enquiry and conclude the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this order.

7. Stay application and all pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J

Ashu/30

