



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<p><b>WPSS 492/2024</b> <b><u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u></b></p> <p>Mr. Abhishek Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.</p> <p>Mr. Pradeep Hairiya, Additional CSC, for the State.</p> <p>(2) Petitioner was engaged through an outsourcing agency (UPNL) in Forest Department. His engagement was discontinued, vide order dated 17.2.2024, which is under challenge in this writ petition.</p> <p>(3) Perusal of the impugned order reveals that regarding an incident of illicit felling of trees, proceedings were initiated by the Forest Department against the accused person and petitioner visited the house of that accused person and also disclosed certain information, which ought not to have been disclosed. Annexure-3 to the writ petition is the show cause notice, issued by Forest Range Officer, Jhajhra Range, in which it is mentioned that petitioner admitted that he has visited the residence of accused person and the Forest Range officer took exception of petitioner's visit to the house of accused person and observed that if at all petitioner had to visit his house, then he should have sought permission or at least informed the departmental authorities. Impugned order indicates that petitioner was issued warning on earlier occasions also, but he did not improve himself, therefore he was given one month's notice by the impugned order that his engagement with the Forest Department would be discontinued w.e.f. 18.3.2024.</p> <p>(4) Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation made against the petitioner is not substantiated by any evidence and petitioner has been made a scapegoat for</p>



no fault of his.

(5) This Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. Since petitioner is an outsourced employee, therefore, he does not have lien on the post. Moreover, the impugned order was passed after issuing show cause notice to the petitioner. In the writ petition, petitioner has not disputed the averment made in the show cause notice that petitioner visited the residence of the accused person. Thus allegation made in the show cause notice against him has to be treated as accepted.

(6) In para 6 of the writ petition, petitioner contends that he is not bound by the provisions of Official Secrets Act. Even though he is not bound by provisions of the said Act, but it is expected of every employee of the Forest Department, whether regular or outsourced, that he would not divulge sensitive official information to strangers. In the present case, the allegation is that petitioner divulged sensitive official information to the person, who is accused of illicit felling of trees.

(7) Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court declines to interfere with the impugned order. Writ petition thus fails and is dismissed.

(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.)

**27.5.2026**

Pr



2026:UHC:4220

--	--	--	--