

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

Sr. No. 114

CWP No.21771 of 2020

DATE OF DECISION: December 17, 2020

KATAR SINGH AND ANOTHER

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners seek quashing of order dated 13.02.2019 (Annexure P-5) whereby no action for recovery has been initiated against respondent No.4-Ex-Sarpanch.

2. The petitioners have made a complaint against respondent No.4 which was allegedly not being enquired into and thus they approach this Court vide CWP No.20955 of 2018 which was disposed of vide order dated 05.09.2018 with a direction to the Deputy Commissioner, Karnal to look into the pending representations and take action thereupon within a stipulated time frame. Consequently, Deputy Commissioner, Karnal passed order dated 13.02.2019 (Annexure P-5) on the basis of report sent by the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Kunjpura.

CWP No.21771 of 2020

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the aforementioned order is perverse and deserves to be quashed because even though findings of embezzlement against respondent No.4 have been returned, no action has been initiated for recovery of the same.

4. With the assistance of the learned counsel, I have gone through the order dated 14.02.2019 (Annexure P-5) as well as audit report dated 01.05.2017 (Annexure P-1). Although, learned counsel for the petitioners has attempted to refer to passages therefrom in support of his arguments, the passages referred to by him do not lead to an inference that finding of embezzlement has been returned. Thus, I do not find any perversity in the impugned order.

5. No other infirmity or illegality has been pointed out. The writ petition is dismissed.

December 17, 2020

Ankur

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No