

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

(251)

CWP-5736-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 14, 2019

Pritam Lal

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanjit Singh Bakhshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.(ORAL)

In the present writ petition, the claim of the petitioner is for quashing the charge-sheet dated 19.03.2015 (Annexure P-1) as well as order dated 25.01.2017 (Annexure P-6) by which, the suspension period of the petitioner has been treated as an extraordinary leave without pay. At the time of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner will be satisfied in case, the grievance of the petitioner of shifting his annual increment from July to December keeping in view the suspension period is redressed, as during the pendency of the enquiry proceedings, the increment, which the petitioner is otherwise entitled for in July, has been shifted to December due to which, petitioner has suffered monetary loss.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that petitioner has been imposed only a punishment of warning which is a minor punishment and the same cannot be treated as impediment for the release of the benefit under Assured Career Progression Scheme and therefore, respondents be also directed to consider the case of the petitioner for the grant of 1st ACP, which was due to the petitioner in May, 2007.

Learned counsel for the respondents very fairly states that the case of the petitioner for the release of 1st ACP w.e.f. 19.05.2007 as well as the grievance of shifting of the annual increment from July to December will be considered by the department and appropriate order will be passed within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order and in case after passing of order, petitioner is found entitled for any relief, the same will be released to the petitioner within a period of three months thereafter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that keeping in view the statement given by learned counsel for the respondents, petitioner does not wish to press this writ petition any further.

In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of having been not pressed and the respondents will be bound by their statement as recorded above.

Keeping in view the order passed in the present writ petition, CM-17753-CWP-2017 is also disposed of having been redereed infructuous.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

October 14, 2019
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No