

CWP No.4120 of 2016

[1]

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

**CWP No.4120 of 2016
Date of decision:12.07.2016**

Singh Ram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Devender Arya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioner made a complaint to the Lokayukta, Haryana against respondent No.7, which was forwarded to the Director, Department of Development and Panchayat, Haryana and a detailed inquiry was conducted by the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Narnaul, who submitted his report dated 20.11.2014. The said report was further submitted by the Deputy Commissioner, Mohindergarh at Narnaul to the Lokayukta, Haryana, which was duly considered by him and the complaint was dismissed/filed vide his order dated 24.11.2015 while making the following observations:-

“The matter has been discussed and heard and the entire relevant material and evidence collected by the learned Registrar in this matter as well as his above report has also been gone into minutely.

A perusal of the file shows that the learned Registrar in his preliminary report has indicated some discrepancies in the enquiry

CWP No.4120 of 2016

[2]

report, whereupon a clarification was sought from the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad. Today, the Block Development and Panchayat Officer has clarified and also submitted report and receipt indicating that the due amount from the erring Sarpanch has been recovered along with interest. At the same time, the allegation of missing chairs has also not been found to be true, as all the purchased chairs were handed over to the then Sarpanch. Hence, in the given facts and circumstances, no further action is now called for in this matter at the end of this institution.

Disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

All concerned be informed accordingly.”

Although counsel for the petitioner has challenged both the enquiry report dated 20.11.2014 (Annexure P-3) and the order dated 24.11.2015 passed by the Lokayukta, Haryana (Annexure P-6) but there is no pleading in the writ petition much-less evidence appended with it and even no substantial argument has been raised by him to dislodge the enquiry report dated 20.11.2014 and to find fault with the order dated 24.11.2015 passed by the Lokayukta, Haryana.

In view thereof, I do not find any reason to interfere in the present petition and hence, the same is hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit.

July 12, 2016
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge