



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH

ON THE 11th OF AUGUST, 2026

WRIT PETITION No. 32807 of 2026

NEHA PACHISIA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Mohan Sausarkar with Shri Shubham Kumar Dwivedi - Advocate
for the petitioner.

Shri Harpreet Singh Ruprah- Additional Advocate General with Shri
Aakash Malpani, learned counsel for the Respondent/State.

.....
ORDER

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:

- "i. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari, quashing and setting "8 the impugned administrative orders dated 16.09.2025 (P/6) and 22.07. 2024 (P/7) to the extent they arbitrarily, unreasonably and without 'any lawful justification curtail the supervisory jurisdiction and administrative responsibilities of the petitioner as the City Superintendent of Police, Katni;
- ii. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus, commanding the respondents to restore the petitioner's supervisory jurisdiction and administrative responsibilities commensurate with her rank, position, seniority, experience and service profile, by re-entrusting the supervisory control over the police stations and establishments which were arbitrarily withdrawn by the impugned orders, or by assigning equivalent supervisory responsibilities in accordance with law;
- iii. Pass such other and further writ, order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, to secure the ends of justice."



2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned orders are ex-facie arbitrary, discriminatory, and legally unsustainable. It is submitted that the impugned orders do not disclose any reasons whatsoever for the drastic reduction of the petitioner's supervisory powers, nor do they indicate that the respondents undertook any objective assessment of administrative requirements before altering the distribution of jurisdiction. To challenge the supervisory authority of Superintendent of Police, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied on **Regulation 36** of the *Madhya Pradesh Police Regulations* and submits that an Assistant Superintendent of Police/Deputy Superintendent of Police is authorised to perform all such functions of the Superintendent of Police as are not required by law to be performed personally, besides conducting inquiries, inspections and making recommendations in administrative matters. He, therefore, prays for setting aside the order dated 16.09.2025 and 22.07.2026.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General for the respondent/State submits that the order has been issued in administrative exigency and in public interest. It is merely an internal distribution of work to perform administrative functions. It is further submitted that Regulation 36 of the *Madhya Pradesh Police Regulations* uses the word 'may' which itself interprets as the discretion of the Superintendent of Police to delegate such powers to their subordinates. He therefore prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances and the fact that



Regulation 36 which empowers the Superintendent of Police to delegate power to perform an administrative function through the subordinates and such Regulation contains the word 'may' which has to be interpreted as the discretion of the authority to delegate the power or not. Therefore, the Superintendent of Police is well within the power to issue the impugned orders dated 16.09.2025 and 22.07.2026 and I do not find any infirmity in the said orders.

6. Accordingly, the petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

(VIVEK KUMAR SINGH)
JUDGE

P/-