

CWP-26673-2019 (O&M)

308

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

**CWP-26673-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : 27.09.2019**

Jagbir Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

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 04.05.2019 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No.3, whereby departmental enquiry has been ordered against the petitioner, on having been falsely implicated in a criminal case bearing FIR No.0006 dated 04.05.2019 under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station, SVB Gurgaon, and further writ of mandamus directing the respondents to keep in abeyance the departmental enquiry.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in both departmental and criminal proceedings, most of the witnesses are common/identical. In case the witnesses are examined in departmental

CWP-26673-2019 (O&M)

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.

27.09.2019
Yogesh Sharma

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

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