

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

[129]

**RSA No.4758 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.11.2015.**

Sukhwant Singh

...Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Ms. Anupam Bhanot, 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)

Impugned in the present Regular Second Appeal is the judgment and decree dated 30.05.2015, passed by learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh, affirming the judgment and decree dated 12.09.2014, passed by learned Civil Judge, Senior Division, Chandigarh, vide which the suit of the plaintiff was dismissed leaving the parties to bear its own cost.

In nutshell, the plaintiff was appointed as Driver on probation basis on 29.03.2000 with defendant No.3-President, State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Punjab. According to him, his services were terminated on 28.07.2000 on account of unsatisfactory work and performance. It was claimed by the

defendants that his work and conduct was not found fit to continue in service during the probation and due to his unsatisfactory work and performance his services have been dispensed with.

I have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have also carefully gone through the file.

The learned counsel for the appellant has contended that there were allegations of theft of petrol and spare parts, therefore, enquiry should have been held. However, the termination order shows that services of the plaintiff were dispensed with during probation on account of unsatisfactory work and performance.

The impugned order dated 28.07.2000 amounts to discharge from the service during probation. In the said order, no allegations were leveled against him. Therefore, it does not amount to punishment order. Consequently, no inquiry was required. It is the personal satisfaction of the authority concerned whether the work and conduct of the employee during probation is satisfactory and if it is found unsatisfactory no fault can found with the said order. Findings of facts have been recorded by the two Courts below. No substantial question of law arises.

Hence, the present appeal is dismissed.

November 17, 2015

Ankur

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**