

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

CWP No. 17444 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION :- August 21, 2015

Virender Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.JEYAPPAUL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Gagan Pradeep S. Bal, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest? Yes/No

M.JEYAPPAUL, J.

1. Heard the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner has virtually challenged the order of the Tribunal dismissing the original application filed before it as infructuous in view of the fact that the enquiry against the petitioner was completed and order of punishment was also passed by the disciplinary authority. The Tribunal has also directed the official

respondent to pass appropriate orders on the plea submitted by the petitioner seeking subsistence allowance.

3. Inasmuch as the enquiry was over and punishment also was awarded to the petitioner, we do not find any merit in the Writ Petition. The Writ Petition is dismissed giving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order of dismissal passed as against him. Even if he is aggrieved as against the order passed by the official respondent as regards his plea for subsistence allowance during the period of suspension, he is at liberty to challenge the same as well.

**(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE**

**(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

August 21, 2015

p. singh