

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

**CWP No.18344 of 2016  
Date of Decision.01.04.2022**

Jasvir Singh

...Petitioner

Vs

The State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present: Mr. K.S. Godara, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ambika Bedi, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)**

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of certiorari/mandamus to quash and set aside the impugned order dated 06.07.2016 passed by respondent No.3.

In brief, the facts of the case are that the petitioner herein was posted a Gunman with Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Sardulgarh for the security of the said Judge. It is alleged that on account of said Judge becoming angry, a letter was communicated to Senior Superintendent of Police, Mansa, intimating that the petitioner was absent from duty on 06.07.2016. Another letter was also addressed by respondent No.3, on the same date itself, to respondent No.2, for attaching salary of the petitioner by showing him absent from duty consequent to which salary of the petitioner w.e.f. July, 2016 was stopped.

Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner

never absented from duty and the impugned orders came to be passed by an authority which was not competent to do so. The impugned orders showing the petitioner absent from duty and directing that his salary be stopped are thus not sustainable.

Counsel for the respondent-State submits that in fact a detailed enquiry was held and it was found that the petitioner was not absent from the duty, consequent to which his salary was released and he is continuing in service with his full salary. She further submits that the grouse of the petitioner does not survive.

I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the pleadings of the case, which is limited to raising grievance against the action of respondent No.3 regarding stopping of the salary. In view of the fact that there is a written statement on the record submitting that the petitioner was found to be on duty and that his salary is being paid to him continuously, I find no reason to interfere in the instant petition.

Accordingly the instant petition stands disposed of.

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**  
**JUDGE**

**April 01, 2022**  
P.Bhatt

Whether speaking/reasoned      Yes/No

Whether reportable                  Yes/No