

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

**CWP-5921-2022**

**Date of decision: March 24, 2022**

Ravinder Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

**Present:** Mr. Mandeep Singh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.  
**(Presence marked through video conference)**

Ms. Kirti Singh, DAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)**

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 17.03.2021 (Annexure P-3) vide which respondent No.1 suspended the petitioner from his services on the basis of a false complaint and without conducting any enquiry and affording any opportunity of hearing.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had joined on the post of Sub-Inspector with the respondent-Department on 20.11.2007 and thereafter, was promoted to the post of Inspector, Food and Supply and is currently posted at Panipat. He submits that on 15.03.2022, a complaint by the residents of Nurwala, Vikash Nagar, Tehsil Camp, Kutani Road, Babail Road and Ujha Road was made against the petitioner alleging that petitioner is supporting the depot holders of their areas who are not providing ration to them as per the schemes of the Government. He submits that the Director General, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs,

Haryana wrote a letter dated 17.03.2022 to respondent No.2 to conduct an enquiry and submit report by 22.03.2022. He submits that the respondent-Department is in that much hurry of suspending the petitioner from the services that on the same day, i.e. 17.03.2022 itself, it has issued the impugned order of suspension of the petitioner from services.

3. On advance service, learned State counsel appears and opposes the issuance of notice of motion.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Grievance of the petitioner herein is that no enquiry was conducted prior to the passing of the impugned order vide which his services have been put under suspension. Neither service Rules envisage nor otherwise is there any requirement in law to conduct an enquiry prior to passing of the order of suspension. Perusal of the facts pleaded in the petition itself shows that the impugned order has been passed on contemplation of initiating departmental proceedings. Petitioner has approached this Court prematurely. As regards his other grievance and claim for re-instatement, the same is left open for the petitioner to pursue before the competent authority. It is expected of the competent authority to look into the same and proceed in accordance with law.

6. No grounds for interference are made out. Dismissed.

**(ARUN MONGA)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 24, 2022**

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No