

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

108

.2023:PHHC:093605
CM-11490-2023 in/and
CWP No.23711-2021(O&M)
DECIDED ON: 24.07.2023

Maaninder Singh Deol

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr.Vivek Chauhan, Advocate,
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Paramjit Batta, Addl. A.G.Punjab.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J (ORAL)

1. The matter came up on an application moved by the petitioner for preponing the date of hearing.
2. The main case is preponed for today.
3. At this stage, both the counsel were heard at length and this Court finds that the petitioner has preferred this writ petition challenging the in-house inquiry being conducted by the respondents relating to certain complaints being filed with regard to the process of regularization of the petitioner.
4. It is the case of the petitioner that earlier also the inquiry was conducted thrice and on the complaints made relating to his regularization and the said authorities have reached to the conclusion that his regularization was in order and there was no discrepancies in regularizing the petitioner. He submits that again the respondents are conducting inquiry and thereby harassment is being caused to him.
5. I have considered the submissions.
6. While certain finality is to be arrived at in an inquiry, the Govt. employee ought not be made to face one after another inquiry proceedings with regard to the same type of complaint. However, this Court finds that the

respondents have not conducted any regular inquiry under the Classification, Control and Appeal Rules, 1965 and the petitioner is merely facing in-house inquiry on the complaints being filed against him. The petitioner is always free to inform the authorities and place on record the findings of the earlier inquiry. The concerned inquiry officer is expected to look into the result of the previous inquiry and take a decision accordingly.

7. So far as the writ petition is concerned, since no cause of action has arisen, the writ petition is held to be not maintainable, at this stage. Accordingly, dismissed.
8. However, dismissal shall not come in the way of the petitioner to submit his explanation before the concerned officer.
9. Interim orders passed earlier stand vacated.
10. The writ petition is dismissed.
11. All pending civil misc. application(s), shall also stand dispose of, in view of the disposal of the main petition.

24.07.2023
mamta

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No