

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14392-CAT of 2013

Date of Decision:-1.4.2016.

The Union Territory, Chandigarh and others

.....Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

- 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?**

Present: Mr. A.P. Setia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for respondent No.1.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

1.) The controversy pertains to the claim of appointment of respondent No.1 as a Constable in Chandigarh Police. He was denied appointment on account of his involvement in a criminal case, the facts in relation where to were allegedly concealed by him in the application form. It is stated that respondent No.1 was otherwise acquitted in the criminal case.

2.) The controversy as regard to the effect of acquittal in a criminal case or concealment of the factum of involvement in a criminal case etc. have since been gone into by a Division Bench of

this Court in **CWP No.3532 of 2013 (Union Territory, Chandigarh and others Vs. Pardeep Kumar and others)** and other connected cases decided on 24.2.2016.

3.) Since the Tribunal has decided a bunch of matters together by common order, we are satisfied that the claim of respondent No.1 requires fresh adjudication by the Tribunal keeping in view the Division Bench's decision cited above. We, thus, allow the writ petition in part; set aside the order passed by the Tribunal for appointment of respondent No.1, and remit the case to the Tribunal for fresh adjudication in the light of the cited decision.

4.) The parties are directed to appear before the Tribunal on 27.4.2016.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

April 1, 2016.

sandeep sethi