

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

CWP No.10898 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:02.08.2023

Sandeep Kumar Aggarwal

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rikash Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

-.-

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the termination order dated 12.05.2018 (P-9) passed against the petitioner, which has been impugned in the present writ petition is causing prejudice to the petitioner, as the petitioner is not able to get any other employment in view of the allegations made therein, as the same is stigmatic.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submits that the respondent-Department is liable to substitute the said impugned order with an innocuous order so that the same does not cause prejudice to the petitioner any further employment which the petitioner will compete for.

Learned State counsel submits that the department has no objection to substitute the impugned order with an innocuous order so that the grievance being raised by the petitioner that he is suffering prejudice on the basis of certain allegations mentioned in the impugned order can be redressed. Learned State counsel further submits that the said impugned order will be substituted and a

fresh order will be conveyed to the petitioner within a period of 15 days from today.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the statement made by learned State counsel, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.

Ordered accordingly.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

August 02, 2023

Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No