

CWP-25263-2019

156

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

**CWP-25263-2019
Date of decision : 10.09.2019**

Narender Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Lather, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. R.K. Doon, AAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent(s)/State.

The petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, quashing order dated 31.08.2018 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2, whereby regular departmental enquiry was ordered against the petitioner, on having been falsely implicated in a criminal case bearing FIR No.0012 dated 24.08.2018 under Sections 7 & 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau, Faridabad, and further writ of mandamus directing the respondents not to examine the material witnesses cited in department enquiry.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in both

CWP-25263-2019

departmental and criminal proceedings, most of the witnesses are common/identical. In case the witnesses are examined in departmental proceedings, then it will affect his right in defending the criminal proceedings. In support of his contentions, reliance has been placed upon the *ratio decidendi* culled out by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **"Capt. M. Paul Anthony V/s Bharat Gold Mines Ltd." 1999 (2) SCT 660.**

Learned State Counsel submitted that there is no bar for continuation of departmental enquiry along with criminal case, which can be initiated and go side by side, but did not dispute the fact that few of the witnesses are common/identical in the proceedings.

I have heard learned counsel for parties, appraised paper book and of view that since few of witnesses are common/identical in both the proceedings, the Department shall not examine the common/identical witnesses, until and unless, they are examined in the criminal proceedings first, as there is perceptible apprehension of disclosing the defence.

It is made clear that in case, the petitioner is found to be delaying in cross-examination of same set of the witnesses in the criminal proceedings, this order will not come in the way of the Department to examine the said witnesses.

With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

10.09.2019
Yogesh Sharma

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	Yes/ No