

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Case No. : C. W. P.No. 6699 of 2013

Date of Decision : November 19, 2015

Manoj Kumar Petitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL.

* * *

To be referred to Reporters or not ?

Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

* * *

Present : Mr. S. M. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. :

Through the present petition, the petitioner seeks to challenge the punishment meted out to him for acts of omission and commission on his part.

Though the petition has been filed on several grounds, the only one pressed before me was the ground of discrimination in the quantum of punishment meted out to the petitioner. It has been submitted that the petitioner, along with one Sat Pal Singh, was charge-sheeted on account of negligence with regard to verification of gate passes for entry into the

Indian Oil Depot at Ambala. After the delinquent officials had been found guilty, the petitioner had been inflicted the punishment of stoppage of five increments with cumulative effect, whereas the aforementioned Sat Pal Singh had been inflicted the punishment of stoppage of two increments with cumulative effect.

A perusal of the record shows that the proven misconduct on the part of the petitioner, as also the aforementioned Sat Pal Singh, who were serving the Haryana Police as Head Constables, was that they had, without any verification whatsoever of forms, appended their signatures thereupon and permitted entry of persons into the Indian Oil Depot at Ambala, which was a serious security lapse.

A perusal of the record reveals that there appears to be no distinction at all in the proven misconduct of the petitioner and Sat Pal Singh. Thus, it would be unfair to punish the petitioner with stoppage of five increments with cumulative effect as compared to the punishment meted out to Sat Pal Singh, which is stoppage of two increments with cumulative effect.

Thus, on parity, the punishment meted out to the petitioner is modified to two increments with cumulative effect.

The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

November 19, 2015
monika