

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RSA No.1138 of 1993 (O&M)

Date of Order:10.10.2023

Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala and another

.Appellants

Versus

Harminderjit Singh

..Respondent

RSA No.1778 of 1993 (O&M)

Punjab State Electricity Board and another

.Appellants

Versus

Mohan Lal

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Mayur Karkra, Advocate,
for the appellant (in both the RSAs)

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. The learned counsel representing the appellant in both the regular second appeals submits that the findings of fact arrived at by the courts below cannot be successfully challenged by the appellant as there is a fundamental defect in the procedure adopted while punishing the respondents in both the suits. It is submitted that, in fact, the charge sheet was issued to the respondent-employee under Regulation 8 of the Punjab State Electricity Board Employees (Punishment & Appeal) Regulations, 1971. Whereas, after receipt of the reply, by a non-speaking and cryptic order minor punishment was awarded. He submits that in view of the judgment passed by the Division Bench in **Sarupinder Singh vs. Punjab State Electricity Board and another, (CWP No.16241 of 2005, decided on 07.05.2007)**, he is unable to draw the attention of the court to any error in

the judgment passed by the courts below.

2. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, these two appeals are dismissed.
3. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

October 10, 2023

nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:YES/NO

:YES/NO