

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

**RSA No.3148 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 01, 2015**

Surinder Singh

.... Appellant

vs.

Punjab State Electricity Board and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate for the appellant.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

CM Nos.7545-C and 7546-C of 2015

There is delay of 23 days in re-filing and 60 days in filing the present appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the applications supported by affidavits, delay of 23 days in re-filing and 60 days in filing the present appeal is condoned, subject to all just exception.

Applications stand disposed of.

RSA No.3148 of 2015

Impugned in the present regular second appeal is the judgment and decree dated 01.10.2014 passed by learned District Judge, Gurdaspur, vide which the judgment and decree dated 28.07.2012 passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.),

Gurdaspur, was reversed, thereby allowing the appeal of the defendants and dismissing the suit of the plaintiff.

Learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Gurdaspur vide judgment and decree dated 28.07.2012 had decreed the suit and gave directions to the defendants-department to reconsider the matter of the plaintiff within six months from the passing of the said order after holding that the proper inquiry was not conducted.

However, learned District Judge, Gurdaspur after going through the record, found that proper inquiry was conducted and it is for the plaintiff to point out as to how the proper inquiry was not conducted.

I have gone through the judgment and decree dated 01.10.2014 passed by learned District Judge, Gurdaspur. It comes out that as per admission of the plaintiff himself, he was appearing on each and every date of hearing and he submitted reply to the charge-sheet. He was given full opportunity to lead his evidence. Some statements were also produced by the defendants. It was not claimed that in reply to the show cause notice that he had claimed opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses and was denied the same. The allegations against the plaintiff are that he got the job of workcharge employee by producing some false and fabricated documents. The findings of the facts have been recorded by the learned District Judge, Gurdaspur, which cannot be interfered in the regular second appeal. No substantial question of law arises in the present appeal.

Hence, the present regular second appeal stands dismissed.

October 01, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE