

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

**CWP No.14721 of 2015  
Date of decision-24.02.2016**

**Union of India and others**

**..Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**Bal Indu and others**

**..Respondents**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.JEYAPPAUL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present:- Mr. G.S Bal, Senior Advocate with  
Ms. Kulwant Kaur Kahlon, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Padam Kant Dwivedi, Advocate  
for respondent No.1.

None for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*

**M.JEYAPPAUL, J. (Oral)**

The only point that arises for consideration in this writ petition is whether the Ist respondent is entitled to a copy of the advice given by the Union Public Service Commission as regards the punishment proposed by the disciplinary Authority in culmination of the inquiry conducted against the Ist respondent.

The controversy which has arisen for determination in this writ petition has been squarely answered by us in **Union of India and another vs. Maya Ram and others, 2016(1) S.C.T.275.** Referring to the march of law on the above subject in controversy, this Court categorically held therein that once the disciplinary Authority received the advice from the Union Public Service Commission, it shall communicate such an advice to the delinquent so as to enable him to make a further representation, before ever imposing appropriate penalty on the delinquent.

As the entire controversy arising in this case is covered by the judgment passed by this Court in Maya Ram (supra), we have no hesitation to dismiss the writ petition accepting the view taken by the learned Tribunal in this matter. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

**(M. JEYAPPAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**February 24, 2016**

vanita