

Service matter - Once an order is issued and it is sent out to the concerned government servant, it must be held to have been communicated to him, no matter when he actually received it

Question arose that whether the order of suspension was to be actually received by the employee to be affected. This Court examined the question as to whether communicating the order means its actual receipt by the concerned government servant. The Court held as under:

“16. ...It [will](#) be seen that in all the decisions cited before us it was the communication of the impugned order which was held to be essential and not its actual receipt by the officer concerned and such communication was held to be necessary because till the order is issued and actually sent out to the person concerned the authority making such order would be in a position to change its mind and modify it if it thought fit. But once such an order is sent out, it goes out of the control of such an authority, and therefore, there would be no chance whatsoever of its changing its mind or modifying it. In our view, once an order is issued and it is sent out to the concerned government servant, it must be held to have been communicated to him, no matter when he actually received it. We find it difficult to persuade ourselves to accept the view that it is only from the date of the actual receipt by him that the order becomes effective. If that be the true meaning of communication, it would be possible for a government servant to effectively thwart an order by avoiding receipt of it by one method or the other till after the date of his retirement even though such an order is passed and despatched to him before such date. An officer against whom action is sought to be taken, thus, may go away from the address given by him for [service](#) of such orders or may deliberately give a wrong address and thus prevent or delay its receipt and be able to defeat its service on him. Such a meaning of the word “communication” ought not to be given unless the provision in question expressly so provides ”

[State of Punjab v. Khemi Ram, 1969 S CeJ 002](#)

Tags: [Government servant - Service of order](#), [Punjab Civil Services Rules R. 3.26\(d\)](#), [Service matter - Suspension](#)