

121

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

CWP No.6235 of 2024

Date of decision: 04.04.2024

Chandanpreet Singh and another

..... Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. R. K. Grewal, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ J.

1. This is the second writ petition filed by the petitioners wherein they have approached this Court impugning order dated 16.12.2022 (Annexure P-19) vide which respondent No.6 has been exonerated by issuing advisory/warning by respondents No.1 & 2 and without taking any legal action against respondent No.6 in view of applications/complaints filed against her by the petitioners and others regarding conducting of auction illegally and participating in the same through husband and purchasing the government property in price less than the reserved price and getting other benefits at the cost of department by causing loss to the department.

2. The petitioners earlier approached this Court by way of filing CWP No.23642 of 2023, which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 14.12.2023.

3. The precise grievance of the petitioners against respondent No.6, who was the Block Development & Panchayat Officer is that when the auction of the Government Gypsy had taken place on 09.09.2016, therein he had contended that the gypsy was sold in open auction for an amount of Rs.36,100/- against the reserved price of Rs.50,000/-. The auction purchaser was one Prabhjot Singh, who is the husband of respondent No.6. The petitioners filed a complaint against respondent No.6 and thereafter approached this Court when no action was taken on the complaint filed against respondent No.6. Respondent-State and respondent No.6 filed their respective replies in that writ petition and it was submitted before this Court that action on the complaint filed by the petitioners had already been taken and a warning letter was already issued to respondent No.6 to be vigilant. The petition hence was disposed of vide order dated 14.12.2023.

4. Now, the petitioners has again approached this Court assailing the order/memo dated 16.12.2022 (Annexure P-19). As it is evident from the record that the petitioners are neither the members of the Panchayat Samiti nor the members of any Gram Sabha thus, their *locus standi* is seriously questioned.

5. However, this Court taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstance of the case had disposed of the earlier writ petition filed by the petitioners.

6. Filing of the present petition by the petitioners is totally misconceived as is evident that the requisite action on the complaint filed by the petitioners was already taken and respondent No.6 was issued a warning letter.

7. This Court is of the opinion that the requisite action taken by the State is commensurate in the allegations made against her as respondent No.6 was not the auction purchaser. The petitioners failed to establish their *locus standi*.

8. This Court, as already mentioned, had disposed of the earlier petition bearing CWP No.23642 of 2023 filed by the petitioners vide order dated 14.12.2023. Hence, finding the petition filed by the petitioners to be totally misconceived, the same is hereby dismissed.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

04.04.2024
rittu

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