

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 1717 of 2014

Date of decision : 23.01.2015

Prem Singh

....Petitioner

V/s

The Deputy Commissioner, Ferozepur & ors.

....Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Peeyush Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Yatinder Sharma, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Harpal Singh, Advocate for respondent no. 3

RAJAN GUPTA J.

Petitioner has assailed the orders, Annexures P1, P2 & P6 dated 17.07.2007, 26.02.2009 & 28.02.2013 respectively whereby petitioner has been removed from the post of Chowkidar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that authorities have acted in arbitrary manner. They ignored from consideration the fact that petitioner has served the Gram Panchayat for more than 30 years and there was no complaint pending against him. Thus, impugned orders deserve to be set-aside.

Plea has been vehemently opposed by learned counsel representing the respondents.

Heard.

It appears that a complaint was received against the petitioner wherein it was stated that petitioner was not performing his duties properly. He was not making entries of new born in the

relevant register. Villagers were not happy with his conduct. Pursuant to same, petitioner was summoned and his explanation was sought by Sub Divisional Magistrate. During hearing, Sarpanch and Lambardar of the village also appeared before said authority and produced a resolution passed by Panchayat requesting to remove the petitioner from the post of Chowkidar. After considering entire material, Sub Divisional Magistrate passed order dated 17.07.2007 removing the petitioner from the post of Chowkidar. Petitioner unsuccessfully challenged the findings before the appellate authority.

I find no ground to interfere with the orders passed by the authorities below. In case residents are not satisfied with the working of petitioner, they were at liberty to move appropriate application before the Sub Divisional Magistrate. Petitioner was granted due opportunity of hearing by both the authorities. They came to the concurrent findings that work and conduct of the petitioner was not satisfactory.

Under the circumstances, there is no ground to interfere in writ jurisdiction. Dismissed.

January 23, 2015
Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE