



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

229

RSA-2225-2022 (O & M)
Date of Decision:20.08.2024

ASI LAKHA SINGH

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: None for the appellant.

Mr. Anil Bansal, DAG, Punjab.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

1. Pursuant to order dated 10.04.2024, respondents have filed an additional affidavit of Superintendent of Police, (Headquarter) Patiala, wherein it has been deposed as under:-

“3. That in this regard, it is submitted that in compliance to the above said order dated 10-04-2024 passed by this Hon'ble Court, it is submitted that it has been clearly mentioned in order No.20591-95/B dated 02-09-1993 by the then Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala that two years service of the appellant- HC Lakha Singh No.1634/PTL (now Retd.) was forfeited on permanent basis for stoppage of annual increments (not forfeiture of approved service) and as per service book/record of the appellant, it has been found that the basic pay of the appellant-HC Lakha Singh was fixed w.e.f. 01-01-1993 from Rs 1550+10/- to Rs. 1600+10/- per month. However w.e.f. 01-01-1994 and 01-01-1995



RSA-2225-2022 (O & M)

-2-

two annual increment of the appellant were stopped by then Sr. Superintendent of Police, Patiala for the purpose of annual increments. Thereafter vide order Book No.3421 of 1996, the Pay of the appellant-HC Lakha Singh was again refixed as under:-

01-01-1993	1600+10	Already drawing
01-01-1994	---	Two years service for stoppage of increment w.e.f. 01.01. 1994 and 01.01.1995 was forfeited vide order No. 3200 of 1993
01-01-1995	----	
01-01-1996	1600+10 to 1650+10	Again refixed.

4. It is also clarified that the penalty imposed against the appellant-HC Lakha Singh regarding forfeiture/withholding of two annual increments only but the length of service to be counted for the purpose of Pension will not be affected. In this regard history sheet of the appellant is attached herewith as Annexure R-1. ”

2. There is no representation on behalf of the appellant. Similar was the position on the previous occasion. It seems that in view of the clarification given by the respondents in the above reproduced affidavit, appellant is not interested in pursuing the appeal.

3. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

4. Pending application(s), if any, is disposed of.

20.08.2024
sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No