

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.27091 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION: JANUARY 18, 2016

SATVIR SINGH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

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

1. Whether the judgement should be reported in the digest? Yes/No

PRESENT: MR. MANU K.BHANDARI, ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER.

M. JEYAPPAUL, J.

1. The writ petitioner has challenged the rejection of his plea for quashing the letter dated 14.10.2015 issued to him by the Chairperson of Sexual Harassment of Sports Authority of India, New Delhi.

2. It was vehemently contended by learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner that an inquiry was already held and the Chairperson of Sexual Harassment of Sports Authority of India, New Delhi is making an attempt to reopen the enquiry.

4. The impugned communication would read as follows:-

“Please refer to discussion with undersigned during the meeting held on 19.10.2015 in Conference hall, SAI Sports Complex, New Delhi, regarding submission of your explanation within a week, if any, pertaining to the video recording of complainants shown to you. Even after lapse of

15 days, your explanation is still awaited. Therefore, you are hereby once again requested to submit your explanation, if any, within 5 days from the date of receipt of this letter, failing which, it will be presumed that you have nothing to say in the matter.”

5. The above communication would disclose that the writ petitioner has been directed to submit his explanation, if any, before the Committee in connection with the inquiry initiated as against him by the Sexual Harassment Committee. There is no indication in the above communication that the writ petitioner has been directed to face an inquiry which was reopened or a fresh inquiry which was initiated against him.

6. In our considered view, the writ petitioner has approached the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench even before the inquiry initiated as against him had matured into a challengeable order. Therefore, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

January 18, 2016
Gulati

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE