



CWP-10729-2024

1

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

(120)

CWP-10729-2024

Date of Decision : May 09, 2024

Dharam Singh

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. Vineet Dhanda, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Nain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)**

1. Present writ petition has been filed challenging the order of punishment dated 07.03.2012 (Annexure P-3) as well as the order passed in appeal dated 15.04.2022 (Annexure P-8).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the punishment has been imposed upon the petitioner without any valid justification hence, the same is liable to be set aside.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Harish Nain, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the impugned order of punishment was passed after holding a due enquiry and after the



allegations were proved against the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that the punishment has been imposed upon the petitioner keeping in view the gravity of the allegations alleged. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that even in the appeal, due reasons have been given for not accepting the same hence, the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

8. The jurisdiction of the Court to interfere in the departmental proceedings is very limited. The Court can only see whether the departmental proceedings have been held in a manner required. Nothing has come on record that the procedure envisaged for conducting the disciplinary proceedings has been violated by the respondents in any manner. The allegations alleged against the petitioner have been proved and the punishment has been imposed upon him, which punishment has been upheld in appeal by giving due reasons. This Court will not sit in an appeal over the decision of the authorities concerned so as to impose a different punishment.

9. Even otherwise, the punishment is not excessive. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations proved, the punishment has been imposed upon the petitioner, which is not at all shocking or disproportionate in any manner.

10. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present case.

3

**May 09, 2024**  
*harsha*

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

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