

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH
CWP No. 8815 of 2015
Date of decision May 6, 2015

EASI Jaipal

..... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (Oral)

The challenge in the present petition is to the order dated 10.10.2012 (Annexure P-7) and 11.3.2004 (Annexure P-10) passed by the appellate authority and revisional authority whereby the appeal and revision of the petitioner filed against the order of punishment dated 28.6.2012 has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order Annexures P-7 and P-10 have been passed without giving any reasons much less cogent reasons and are not sustainable in law.

I do not deem it appropriate to issue notice to the respondents as the impugned orders are exfacie not sustainable in the eyes of law.

On perusal of impugned orders Annexure P-7 and P-10 am of the view that the orders have been passed in most sketchy, mechanical and shoddy manner. The authorities were required to deal with all the points raised by the delinquent employee and thereafter ought to have passed the order.

From the perusal of the impugned orders it is evident that the authorities have not applied their mind and accordingly the orders are not sustainable in the eyes of law, therefore, I deem it appropriate to set aside the order and remand the matter back to the appellate authority to decide the appeal filed by the petitioner dated 27.7.2012 afresh.

It is expected that the appellate authority shall decide the appeal within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order by passing a detailed and reasoned order.

The writ petition stands allowed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 6, 2015
archana