

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

CWP No.3060 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Order: 30.7.2015

Ghanshyam Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Ors.

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Tarundeep Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pardeep Solath, Advocate for respondent No.3.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI,J (ORAL)

This petition has been filed against the order dated 19.09.2011 (P.3) whereby the suspension period of the petitioner was treated as on duty for all intents and purposes except for salary.

In the order, it was also recorded that a warning had been issued in respect of two charge sheets. Thirteen years later, the petitioner filed an appeal against the said order, which was rejected and revision against that was also rejected. That is how the petitioner is before this Court.

In my opinion, the act of the petitioner in not challenging the order for a long period of thirteen years way beyond the period of limitation provided under the Rules renders him ineligible to challenge the same.

Even otherwise, this is not a case where no punishment was imposed. Minor punishment of warning was imposed. In these circumstances, the argument that merely because the petitioner was treated to be on duty for all intents and purposes and, therefore salary has to be granted to him, cannot be accepted.

Dismissed.

July 30, 2015
manoj

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE