IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision : October 15, 2020

1. Criminal Revision No. 800 of 2020

Vinod Jain ....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana ....Respondent

2. Criminal Revision No. 857 of 2020

Surjeet Singh ....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana ....Respondent

3. Criminal Revision No. 864 of 2020

Sushil Kumar Gupta ....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana ....Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Fateh Deep Singh

Present : Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate, for petitioner-Vinod Jain in CRR No. 800 of 2020

Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate, for petitioner Surjeet Singh in CRR No. 857 of 2020

Mr. Shvetanshu Goel, Advocate, for petitioner Sushil Kumar Gupta in CRR No. 864 of 2020

Mr. Baljinder Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

Fateh Deep Singh, J.

The above detailed three criminal revisions under Section 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure by convicts-revisionists Vinod Jain, Surjeet Singh and Sushil Kumar Gupta are an outcome of common judgment dated 6.3.2020 of the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra and thus are being taken up together for disposal through this common order.

Upon hearing arguments at length by Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate, for petitioner-Vinod Jain in CRR No. 800 of 2020, Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate, for petitioner Surjeet Singh in CRR No. 857 of 2020,Mr. Shvetanshu Goel, Advocate, for petitioner Sushil Kumar Gupta in CRR No. 864 of 2020 and Mr. Baljinder Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana and having the opportunity to peruse the records of the case with invaluable assistance of the counsel as well as the written submissions so made.

Before venturing into the relative merits of case of the two sides, it is essential to explore and go into the background which led to this conviction. The Haryana State Co-operative Supply and Marketing Federation Limited (**HAFED**), Kurukshetra entered into an agreement dated 26.9.20029 (Ex. P/3) with firm M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders (in short, the miller) through its proprietor Paras Jain son of revisionist Vinod Jain. By virtue of this agreement, HAFED gave 79010.75 quintals of paddy for the Kharif season 2009 to this firm for custom milling. Along with the paddy, 105595 gunny bags, 3889 wooden crates and 239 tarpaulins were also given to his firm by the HAFED. As per terms of this agreement, the firm was to return 67% of this paddy by way of rice to HAFED to be delivered to FCI on their behalf. The firm issued a cheque of Rs one crore to HAFED besides giving FDR of Rs 5 lacs pledged with HAFED and on this agreement one Satish Kumar (proprietor of M/s Jai Jagdama Rice Mills) Sunil Kumar (proprietor M/s Hans Trading Company), Vilayati Ram (proprietor of M/s Arora Enterprises) signed as sureties on the surety bond. On this bond revisionist Vinod Jain father of Paras Jain and proprietor of M/s Jain Agro Industries signed as witness (Ex. P4 to Ex. P6). It is worth while to refer here that revisionist Vinod Jain has now rechristened this firm as M/s Haryana Food Rice Mills which is located at Mathana and is now transacting business with Haryana Agro Industries Corporation. It is pertinent to refer here that Paras Jain son of Vinod Jain is reported to have disappeared in the year 2010 (though has been subsequently arrested after years and is now facing trial as well) and further that M/s Jain Agro Industries has been declared a defaulter after the year 2010.

During the course of time, the miller returned only 29117.25 quintals of milled rice and thereby have misappropriated 35552.18 quintals of paddy and thereby causing financial loss amounting to Rs 6,82,35,552/- to HAFED. It is as a consequence of this embezzlement Shri Anil Ahlawat, District Manager, HAFED, (PW5) made a written complaint (Ex. PW5/A) dated 29.11.2010 leading to registration of case by way of FIR No. 440 dated 1.12.2010 under Sections 406, 409, 420, 120-B IPC, Police Station Thanesar, Kurukshetra against Vinod Jain father of Paras Jain, his Munim (Clerk) Surjit Singh and Sushil Kumar Gupta, Clerk HAFED, all the present revisionists.

At the trial the prosecution examined the following witnesses:-

PW1	Neelam Jain
PW1	Prem Raj Giri, DOMS Hafed
PW2	Ramesh Chand, Accountant Hafed
PW3	Mehar Chand, Accounts Officer, Hafed
PW4	Manjeet Sharma, Store Keeper

PW5	Anil Ahlawat, District Manager, Hafed
PW6	Shyam Lal,
PW7	Tulsi Dass,
PW8	Sat Pal, Accountant
PW9	Sher Singh Yadav, Manager, Hafed
PW10	Ashok Goyal, Notary Public
PW11	Jagtar Singh, Driver of Truck
PW12	Siri Chand, Driver of Truck
PW13	SI Prem Chand,
PW14	Gurnam Singh,
PW15	SI Nand Lal (Rtd),
PW16	Kuldeep Singh, Manager FCI
PW17	SI Kewal Singh,
PW18	Inspector Satish Kumar,
PW19	Gulab Singh, Investigating Officer (part)

The prosecution also proved the following documents:-

Ex.P1	Copies of information & Guidelines of Allotment Criteria dated 18.09.2009 for procurement in Kharif 2009 (KMS)
Ex.P2	Copy of format of Agreement;
Ex.P3	Copy of Agreement dated 26.9.2009 with accused Firm (Actual including surety amount shown);

Ex.P4	Copy of Surety Bond (by Sunil Kumar);
Ex.P5	Copy of Surety bond (by Walaiti Ram);
Ex.P6	Copy of Surety bond (by Satish Kumar);
Ex.P7	Letter to HAFED dated 23.01.2010 (by Shri Guru Roshan Traders – Acceptance of Rice with quantity);
Ex.P8	Letter to HAFED dated 27.01.2010(by Shri Guru Roshan Traders – Acceptance of Rice with quantity);
Ex.P9	Copy of list of inward delivery challan of Kharif-2009(by Shri Guru Roshan Traders – Acceptance of Rice with quantity);
Ex.P10	Letter of shifting stock to M/s. Jain Agro dated 09.08.2010 (intimation of information by Hafed);
Ex.P11	Letter of shifting stock to M/s. Jain Agro dated 23.08.2010 (intimation of information by Hafed);
Ex.P12	Letter of shifting stock to M/s. Jain Agro dated 06.09.2010 (intimation of information by Hafed);
Ex.P13	Letter of shifting stock of Shri Guru Roshan Traders to M/s. Jain Agro;
Ex.P14	Copy of notice (by Hafed of breach of agreement to accused Firm dated 11.11.2010);
Ex.P15	Copy of notice (to Surety Walaiti Ram of breach of agreement) dated 11.11.2010;
Ex.P16	Copy of notice dated 11.11.2010 (to Satish Kumar surety of breach of

	agreement);
Ex.P17	Copy of notice dated 11.11.2010 (to Sunil Kumar Surety of breach of agreement);
Ex.P18	Copy of letter dated 23.11.2010 by Incharge CMR of embezzlement;
Ex. P18/B	PV of presence of Rice at Jain Agro to intimation to accused Firm;
Ex.P19	Copy of P.V. Report of accused Firm;
Ex.P20	Copy of detail of CMR delivery;
Ex.P21	Copy of account of custom milling of Kharif from M/s. Shri Guru Roshan Traders, Pipli;
Ex.P22	Copy of Rice Procurement (Levy) Order 1985;
Ex.P22	Copy of letter from D.M. Dated 09.08.2010 of immediate change of duty of Sushil Kumar;
Ex.P23	Copy of letter for submission of request of CMR dated 29.10.2010 and missing of CMR from file while in safe custody;
Ex.P24 also Ex. D5	Copy of report with regard to deposit of agreement etc. of defaulters;
Ex.P25 to Ex. P27	Copies of stock account of accused Firm dated 1.9.2010;
Ex.P28	Memo of recovery of 70 bags & identification from accused Sushil Kumar;
Ex.P29	Disclosure statement of accused Surjeet Singh dated 9.3.2011;

Ex.P30	Disclosure statement of accused Vinod Jain dated 22.3.2011;
Ex.P31	Memo dated 23.3.2011 of recovery of 405 bags of rice & identification from Vinod Jain;
Ex.PW1/A	Recovery memo dated 3.12.2010 of certified records of Hafed;
Ex.PW4/A	Recovery memo of receipt of paddy;
Ex.PW4/C	Copy of verification of paddy of accused Firm on 30.1.2010;
Ex.PW5/A	Complaint dated 29.11.2010 for registration of FIR;
Ex. PW5/B	Endorsement on complaint dated 29.10.2010 by SSP office;
Ex.PW5/C	Request for delivery-letter dated 27.1.2010 by Hafed to accused Firm;
Mark PW5/B	Cheque by Paras Jain to Hafed for Rs One crore;
Ex.PW5/D	Recovery memo of Hafed documents;
Ex.PW6/A	Copy of statement of Sham Lal, u/s 161 Cr.P.C. dated 10.12.2010;
Ex.PW7/A	Copy of statement of Tulsi Dass, u/s 161 Cr.P.C. dated 10.12.2010;
Ex.PW8/A	Copy of statement of Sat Pal Garg u/s 161 Cr.P.C. 8.4.2011;
Ex.PW8/B	Copy of P.V. Report dated 1.8.2010;
Ex.PW9/A	Copy of statement of Sher Singh u/s 161 Cr.P.C. dated 10.12.2010;

Ex.PW9/B	Copy of account of M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders 21.12.2009;
Ex.PW11/A	Copy of statement of Jagtar Singh u/s 161 Cr.P.C. 31.3.2011;
Ex.PW12/A	Copy of statement of Siri Chand, u/s 161 Cr.P.C.31.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/A	Disclosure statement of accused Surjit 10.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/B	Recovery memo of 5000 currency notes from Surjit Singh dated 10.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/C	Disclosure statements of accused Vinod Jain dated 23.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/D	Disclosure statements of accused Vinod Jain dated 26.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/E	Disclosure statements of accused Vinod Jain dated 27.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/F	Demarcation memo dated 27.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/G	Demarcation memo of A.R.Agro Industries,Shahbad dated 27.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/H	Demarcation memo of A.B. Rice Mills, Ladwa dated 27.3.2011;
Ex. PW13/T	Demarcation memo of Mohan Rice Mill Hinori Road, Ladwa dated 27.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/K	Demarcation memo dated 27.3.2011;
Ex. PW13/J	Recovery memo of small Diary from Vinod Jain dated 27.3.2011;
Ex.PW13/L	Demarcation memo dated 28.3.2011 of

	Vinod Jain;
Ex.PW13/M	Demarcation memo dated 28.3.2011 of Vinod Jain;
Ex.PW13/N	Demarcation memo dated 28.3.2011 of Vinod Jain;
Ex.PW13/P	Demarcation memo dated 28.3.2011 of Vinod Jain;
Ex.PW13/Q	Report of Manager Depot, FCI Pipli, Kurukshetra
Ex.PW13/R	Detail;
Ex.PW14/A	Copy of statement of Gurnam Singh, u/s 161 Cr.P.C. dated 31.3.2011;
Ex.PW15/A	Copy of FIR;
Ex.PW15/B	Endorsement;
Ex.PW17/A	Disclosure statement of accused Sushil Kumar dated 11.2.2011;
Ex.PW19/A	Site plan of alleged recovery from Sushil Kumar dated 11.2.2011;
Ex.PW19/B	Site plan of alleged recovery from Surjit Singh dated 10.3.2011;
Ex.PW19/C	Site plan of alleged recovery from Vinod Jain dated 23.3.2011;
Ex.PW19/D	Small diary;
Ex.PW19/E	Site plan of recovery of small dairy dated 27.3.2011 from Vinod Jain;
Mark PA	Copy of Rice regarding Shri Guru Roshan

	Rice Mill, HAFED, Kurukshetra
Mark X	Copy of letter dated 26.11.2010 to accused Sushil Kumar of carelessness.
Ex. D1	Dispatch register/shifting by Vinod Jain to Jain Agro;
Ex. D2	Hafed letter of procurement incharges with Centres;
Ex. D3	Deputing of officials with modification on duty (management of stock on daily basis);
Ex. D6	Letter to Bank by District Magistrate for release of FDR of Jain Agro dated 2.7.2010;
Ex. D8 to D10	Earned leave application of Sushil Kumar;

The Court of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kurukshetra vide judgment dated 12.6.2015 acquitted all the accused of the charges so framed against them. The State filed an appeal wherein, in addition to above, Anil Ahlawat, District Manager, HAFED, Karnal was re-examined before the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge on 11.1.2019 who proved the following documents:-

Ex. A1	Copy of letter dated 25.11.2010 (handing of charge);
Ex. A2	Copy of letter dated 25.11.2010 (cancelling leave of Sushil Kumar);
Ex. A3	Copy of Duty Roster of Shushil Kumar (Maintenance of correspondence of Millers)
Ex. A4	Copy of letter dated 4.1.2011 (Salary of

	Sushil Kumar withheld);
Ex. A5	Copy of letter for earned leave of Sushil Kumar;
Ex. A6	Copy of sanction order of earned leave of Sushil Kumar;
Ex. A7	Copy of application for extension of earned leave of Sushil Kumar;
Ex. A8	Earned leave request of Sushil Kumar;
Ex. A9	Copy of submission of request of CMR (Kharif 2009);
Ex. A10	Copy of letter for non maintenance of record by Sushil Kumar;
Ex. A11	Copy of noting regarding handing over charge;
Ex. PW5/E	Cheque (Copy of Rs 1 crore by M/s Jain Agro);
Ex. PW5/F	Copy of judgment dated 8.1.2013 in complaint of Hafed under section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act;
Ex. D11	Copy of judgment dated 12.4.2017 in appeal in criminal complaint u/s 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act;

It was through impugned judgment dated 6.3.2020, the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra reversed the findings and held all the three guilty of commission of offences under Sections 120-B IPC as well as Section 420 read with Section 120-B IPC and sentenced them as follows:-

Under Section 420 read with Section 120-B IPC	*To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years and to pay fine of Rs 10,000/- each. In case of default in payment of fine, the convicts shall have to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two months.*
Under Section 120-B IPC	*To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years and to pay fine of Rs 10,000/- each. In case of default in payment of fine, the convicts shall have to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of two months.*

It is against this conviction, these three revisions have come about.

Going through the arguments of the two sides and the records at length the premise of the allegations is that all the accused present revision petitioners entered into a criminal conspiracy and with a dishonest intention to facilitate cheating of the HAFED, an undertaking of the State where the complainant was the local incharge being District Manager had committed illegal acts. It is a matter of common knowledge and prudence that there hardly is direct evidence in cases revolving around the criminal conspiracy, unless and until one of the accused has turned as an approver. It is the circumstances and their unbroken chain which needs to lead to irresistible conclusion that it is none but the accused who were instrumental in commission of the crime so alleged. During the course of arguments, it is fairly conceded by the counsel for the petitioners that Vinod Jain happens to be the father of Paras Jain who was the proprietor of M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders to whom paddy was entrusted for custom milling. It is also not displaced that after paddy was entrusted upon entering into an agreement dated 26.9.2009, Ex. P3, sureties furnished bonds Ex. P4 to P6, above said Paras Jain disappeared in the year 2010 when the delivery was to be made and it was thereafter he has been arrested and is facing separate trial. Being a father-son duo, it cannot be accepted that when they are living together the father was in-oblivion to this situation. More-so the records established before this Court by legitimate evidence that in the agreement executed between HAFED and M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders, it was the father Vinod Jain petitioner who witnessed the surety bond and that his cohorts namely Satish Kumar proprietor M/s Jai Jagdama Rice Mills, Sunil Kumar partner M/s Hans Trading Company, Vilayati Ram, proprietor M/s Arora Enterprises stood as sureties. Further-more the connection between Satish Kumar and M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders the accused-firm is that Satish Kumar above said has leased out the premises as a camouflage and it is further proved irrefutably in the cross-examination of SI Nand Lal PW15 the Investigating Officer who concedes that the sureties Satish Kumar, Sunil Kumar and Valayati Ram too were found guilty during the investigations in this larger angle of conspiracy. Why the courts below lost sight of this important fact is anybody's guess. What rather one can perceive is that the studied silence on the part of the department especially the complainant who happens to be the District Manager of the area through whom the transactions have been held too were guilty of active connivance and participation and finding that the matter was getting out of hands had chosen a convenient way to lodge a complaint to save his skin cannot be lost sight of. Not only this, the perusal of the records shows that even other officials Sher Singh, Manjit Singh holding different posts and were responsible for maintaining the records of the firm regarding these transactions had shut off their eyes. The role of the officials of the HAFED are well elicited from the fact that the accused firm had only capacity of 2000 metric tonnes. How and under what circumstances and by what means it was allocated such a massive quantity which was as per the norms laid down by the HAFED in Ex. P1 ought to have been allocated to a firm/company with the capacity of not less than 8000 metric tonnes. As is there in the evidence in case of the accused-firm who accepted paddy beyond their capacity as per Ex. P7 to P9 there ought to have been extended surety in the light of the quantity being supplied to them for custom milling but which did not take place. The missing of the gate passes, bills of receipt and delivery and the fact that physical verification which was to be held fortnightly did not bear this embezzlement evident from Ex. P18, P18/B, Ex. P19, Ex. P20, Ex. P21 throughout till the racket so brought to public gaze are crucial facts which underlined that all was not well even with the working of the officials of the HAFED. To further advance this criminal conspiracy it is well highlighted in the records that the accused firm of accused Vinod Jain M/s Jain Agro Industries during this period subsequent to the fraud, the Sheller was transferred to one Naveen son Shushil Kumar Gupta, Clerk of the HAFED and co-accused of Vinod Jain illustrates that they were hand in glove, besides the fact that as per Ex. P28, 70 bags of the commodity were got recovered from conscious possession of accused Sushil Kumar functionary of the HAFED. No doubt Surjit Singh accused innocently claims to be a Munim of M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders whose proprietor was Paras Jain son of Vinod Jain but as is there in the evidence was working with both father and the son. It would not be out of place to refer here as is in the records commensurate with the submissions of the learned State counsel that M/s Jain Agro

Industries owned by Vinod Jain revisionist father of Paras Jain who was a surety for his son in these transactions was declared defaulter after this malfeasance after the year 2010 and rechristened his firm under the name and style of M/s Haryana Food Rice Mills and started working with Haryana Agro Industries Corporation for similar business of custom milling of paddy shows in abundance of the element of deceit of this person and the prevalence of such dishonesty of rice millers in running their firms and how they achieve their object to do unlawful act with active connivance and alliance with their cohorts and in which normally the State is the victim who is robbed of its wealth by such means which is further corroborated from the conduct of this convict Vinod Jain who stood as surety for his son and had given cheque of Rs One crore Ex. PW5/E which too bounced and for which a separate complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act was filed evidenced from Ex. PW5/F and which matter is now before this Court. As per the own milling policy by way of clause 12, security of Rs 25 lacs per tonne was to be taken and having allocated around 8000 metric tonnes of paddy, the security ought to be Rs two crores and instead only half of that amount of Rs one crore was secured are rather matters how top to bottom in the hierarchy of HAFED every one was working with malafide intention for motivated reason to have rich harvest at the State expense.

The secret alliance of Vinod Kumar with his son is further borne out from the strong circumstances and evidence that on 1.8.2010 as a ploy Vinod Jain played a truant by making an application seeking permission for shifting of paddy from allottee firm M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders to his own firm M/s Jain Agro Industries as per Ex. P10, P11, P12, P13 and subsequently from where on the disclosure statement of this accused 450 bags of the custom/milled rice were got recovered are matters which cannot escape judicial scrutiny.

How the officials of HAFED including the petitioner Sushil Kumar Gupta used to help is further brought about from the evidence that he was deputed by the HAFED to deal with the accused firm Ex. A1, Ex. A3, Ex. P22 and correspond with it and maintain the records and on the sly managed to misplace the important papers with the malafide intention to help the miller and is well established on records from Ex. P23.

That during admitted shifting of paddy by Vinod Jain from M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders to M/s Jain Agro Industries instead of entering into a separate agreement with separate sureties etc., the department failed to observe such precautions and guidelines reflects adversely on the working of the HAFED and it is the officials including its District Manager, the present complainant. Under what authority, the

District Manager allowed Vinod Jain permission to shift the paddy from the premises of the allottee firm M/s Shri Guru Roshan Traders to his own premises are matters which abundantly reflects on the casual approach for achieving definite goals and the matter in which important columns in the agreement Ex. P3 were left blank and subsequently filled in belatedly when the matter was put to trial are quite illustrative of HAFED functioning.

No doubt Surjit Singh has tried to escape his culpability under the facade of being Clerk of the firm and nothing to do rather does not convinces the Court being working with both the firms of the son as well as father was well aware of the deception being played by the proprietors with the department being the author of the accounts and records of these Firms. No doubt only an insignificant cash of Rs 5000/- was got recovered from his conscious possession but above all the circumstances under which he had been working and helping his accomplices in achieving their object cannot be lost track of by the Court. The recovery of 75 bags of paddy from Sushil Kumar during the course of investigations of the case further highlight the factum of this game plan that has been chalked out by the accused and which was to benefit to each other of them in this transaction in robbing the HAFED of its valuable money/goods.

Furthermore the testimonies of prosecution witnesses namely the complainant as PW5, PW1 (sic) Prem Rai Giri DOMS Hafed, PW2 Ramesh Chand, Accountant, PW3 Mehar Chand, Accounts Officer all from Hafed irrefutably establish how for the kharif 2009 the accused Firm was supplied paddy for custom milling and the documents prepared during this including furnishing of sureties by the accused based on State Bank of Patiala proved through PW1 Neelam Jain, PW6 Shyam Lal, PW7 Tulsi Dass. To top it all the manner of this fraud, how it was perpetuated are clearly brought about by the prosecution witnesses consisting of PW8 Sat Pal Accountant of accused Firm, PW9 Sher Singh Yadav, Manager Hafed and PW16 Kuldeep Singh, Manager FCI and the police officials PW15 SI Nand Lal, SI Kewal Singh PW17, Inspector Satish Kumar PW18 and PW19 Gulab Singh who were the police functionaries during the investigations of this case especially in whose presence on the disclosure statements of these accused Ex. PW17/A, Ex. P29, Ex. P30, Ex. P13/A, Ex. PW13/E, Ex. PW13/C, Ex. PW13/D recoveries through Ex. P28, Ex. P31, Ex. PW1/A, Ex. PW4/A, Ex. PW5/D, Ex. PW13/B were made of incriminating nature pointing towards the guilt of the accused. The principal head of charges framed against the accused is that they entered into a criminal conspiracy with each other and acted dishonestly, fraudulently to cheat the department of the complainant. From this evidence of prosecution it is well established that the accused Sushil Kumar Gupta a functionary of the Hafed entrusted to oversee the functioning of accused Firm in respect of custom milling of paddy ensured missing of the records of this Firm from safe custody to hide the embezzlement whereas the accused Surjit Singh Munim of the firms of father and son made and facilitated shifting of paddy and ensuring wrong entries at the behest of accused Vinod Jain who had in conspiracy with his son ensured that the son goes missing and managed to illegally shift the paddy to the premises of his Firm to help this defalcation and thus hide under the garb that he has no concern with the Firm of his son – a clever ploy to escape any liability criminal or civil. Thus, the evidence establishes that to further an illegal act all the accused agreed with each other caused this illegal act to be done till the actual benefit accrued and which they harvested. All these acts point out a common design of these accused.

The trial court failed to appreciate this vital prosecution evidence in totality. Keeping in view that it was a white collar crime carried on by literate business men well enlightened by their advisers and helped by the officials of the complainant department itself. The first appellate court has gone into the vital evidence crucial to prove the offence and has rightly come to a justifiable conclusion holding out the guilt of the accused. There is no illegality or perversity in the findings under challenge and the impugned judgment needs to be upheld and consequently all the revision petitions stand dismissed. Copy of this be sent to Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, for initiating and pursuing appropriate administrative action against the officials of Hafed.

(Fateh Deep Singh)
Judge

October 15, 2020
'tiwana'

Whether speaking/reasoned ? *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable ? *Yes/No*