

CWP No.6655 of 2016

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

CWP No.6655 of 2016
Date of decision: 08.04.2016

Satnam Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH DHALIWAL

- 1) Whether Reporters of the 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. K.K. Saini, Advocate, for the petitioners.

PARAMJEET SINGH DHALIWAL, J. (ORAL)

Instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for quashing the order dated 30.04.2013 (Annexure P-7) passed by respondent No.3 whereby respondent No.5 has been exonerated of the charges framed against him.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners vehemently contended that respondent No.5 was rightly held guilty by the Additional Deputy Commissioner for embezzlement of public money by paying Rs.32,600/- as excess fee to the Advocates. The impugned order passed by respondent No.3 exonerating respondent No.5 of the charges framed against him is against the law, therefore, liable to be set aside.

CWP No.6655 of 2016

I have considered the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioners.

Vide impugned order, respondent No.3 – Director, Rural Development and Panchayat has recorded a specific finding of fact that charge levelled against respondent No.5 for giving excess fee to the Advocate is not proved. Otherwise also it is for the authorities to look into such matters. Furthermore, there is considerable delay in challenging the impugned order.

Since findings of fact have been recorded with regard to payment of fee, I do not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order.

Dismissed.

(Paramjeet Singh Dhaliwal)
Judge

April 08, 2016
R.S.