

136

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

CWP-18838-2017

Date of Decision :23.08.2017

RAJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. C.M.Munjal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent no.1 having accepted the representation of the petitioner against the adverse remarks recorded in his ACRs for the period 2005-06 and 2006-07, has however not decided the representation (Annexure P-6), against stoppage of two annual increments with cumulative effect, as awarded by the Director General of Police, Haryana, upon a revision filed by the petitioner against the orders of the punishing and the appellate authority.

Though in the prima facie opinion of this Court, such representation is not maintainable in terms of the Punjab Police Rules 1934 (as applicable to the State of Haryana), however, learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Rule 14 of the Haryana Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal Rules), 2016, by which, it is contended, that Government may call for and examine the records of any case in which a subordinate authority has passed any order under Rule 9 of the said Rules. Without going into the maintainability of such a representation at this stage, this petition is disposed

of with a direction to respondent no.1 to take a decision on the aforesaid representation, also looking into the issue as to whether such a representation is maintainable in the first place or not.

The decision by respondent no.1 should be taken within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

August 23, 2017
Sunil Devi

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No