



1

WA-2501-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,  
CHIEF JUSTICE

&amp;

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE ACHAL KUMAR PALIWAL

ON THE 19<sup>th</sup> OF DECEMBER, 2025

WRIT APPEAL No. 2501 of 2025

*DHANENDRA CHAODHARY*

*Versus*

*THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

-----  
Appearance:

Shri Pravesh Naveriya - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Anubhav Jain - Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State.  
-----

ORDER

*Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice*

Appellant impugns order dated 21.07.2025 whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant challenging his termination has been dismissed. The services of the appellant were terminated on the finding that the appellant had siphoned the funds to the tune of Rs.1.5 lacs. Since the issue pertained to siphoning of public fund, it was treated to be a major misconduct and order of termination was passed. The contention of the appellant is that the order was passed ex-parte and the inquiry was conducted without giving any opportunity to the appellant to putforth his case.

2. Learned Single Judge has noticed that when show cause notices were issued to the appellant, however, he chose not to file any reply to the show cause notices. Learned Single Judge has noticed that the fact that a sum of Rs.1.5 lacs was withdrawn from the funds of the Gram Panchayat, was established by way of a



bank statement. The money was transferred by using the Vendor ID of the brother of the appellant. In the appeal filed by the appellant against the termination order, appellant had admitted that money was withdrawn using the Vendor ID of his brother without any work having been executed by his brother. The defence put up was that the money was withdrawn on the asking of the Sarpanch and the Secretary. The contention of the appellant is that thereafter the amount was withdrawn in cash and utilised for certain public purposes.

3. Learned Single Judge has noticed that there is an admission by the appellant that money was wrongfully withdrawn using Vendor ID of his brother. The submission that the same was withdrawn at the asking of the Sarpanch or the Secretary could not be substantiated. Even otherwise, it is an admitted case of the appellant that the money was wrongfully withdrawn for purposes other than for which it was sanctioned.

4. Learned Single Judge has held that it was a case of fraud committed with the Gram Panchayat and an admission commission of fraud by the appellant.

5. We find no infirmity in the view taken by the learned Single Judge in rejecting the petition particularly in view of the fact that there is an admission by the appellant that the fund was withdrawn wrongfully and diverted.

6. We find no merit in the appeal. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ACHAL KUMAR PALIWAL)  
JUDGE