

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

\*\*\*\*

**CWP No.6733 of 2020**

**Date of Decision: 16.03.2020**

\*\*\*\*

EHC Ramesh Chander

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana & Ors.

... Respondents

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner

\*\*\*\*

**GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)**

(1) The petitioner EHC Ramesh Chander has *inter alia* prayed for quashing of the impugned notice dated 30.01.2020 (P8) passed by Superintendent of Police, Jhajjar.

(2) The first submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the primary reliance by the competent authority in the notice dated 30.01.2020 is to the ACR for the period 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2018. He submits that there are number of illegalities in the communication of the said ACR. Vide memo dated 25.06.2018 (P6), ACR of two years has been conveyed. Consequently, counsel submits that various objections have been taken by the petitioner in the representation that he had submitted against the said ACR. The said representation has been rejected by the IGP, vide order dated 28.02.2020 (P10).

(3) In the meantime, the petitioner had filed an appeal/representation against the notice dated 30.01.2020 (P8). In this appeal/representation, a request was made that notice dated 30.01.2020 issued by the Superintendent of Police be set aside and the petitioner be allowed to serve the Department beyond the age of 55 years. It is submitted that no decision has been taken on this appeal/representation.

(4) Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 – IGP, Rohtak Range, Rohtak to decide the appeal/representation filed by the petitioner by taking into consideration the objections submitted by him in the appeal/representation as also the supplementary representation that the petitioner undertakes to submit within 2 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is directed that the said appeal be decided as expeditiously as possible.

(5) Meanwhile, *status quo* regarding the service of the petitioner be maintained till the expiry of one week from the date of decision of the appeal.

(6) So ordered.

16.03.2020

Vvishal

**(Girish Agnihotri)**  
**Judge**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?

**Yes/No**

2. Whether reportable?

**Yes/No**