



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

**CWP-22966-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 12-12-2024**

**MOHINDER PAUL BERI (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS
.....Petitioner**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rajeev Kawatra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amarpreet Singh Bains, AAG Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is the suspension order dated 25.04.2019 (Annexure P-2) as well as the order dated 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) vide which, the petitioner (since deceased) was dismissed from service with effect from the date of issuance of the said order dated 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) on the ground that the said order was passed without following the process envisaged under the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1970, rendering the said act on the part of the respondents as arbitrary and illegal.

2. Certain necessary facts pertaining to the present case are mentioned hereinafter for the correct appreciation of the issue in hand.

2.1 The petitioner (since deceased) was working as Additional Director of Factories in the State of Punjab. As per the pleadings, a video clip got circulated on 24.04.1990 in media in which certain allegations were levelled against the petitioner with regards to demand and acceptance of a bribe of Rs.25,000/-. The said video clip was shot at the instance of the local MLA of the area concerned, who thereafter submitted a complaint on 31.05.2019 with regards to the said incident against the petitioner (since deceased). It may be noticed that on the date when the said video clip was circulated, the petitioner was working on extension in service granted to him for a period of one year starting from 01.04.2019 till 31.03.2020 as the petitioner had already attained the age of superannuation on 31.03.2019.

2.2 Keeping in view the said video clip and a report published in local newspaper, the petitioner was placed under suspension on 25.04.2019 itself, vide suspension order of even dated appended as Annexure P-2 with the present petition. As per the said suspension order, the respondents contemplated to initiate departmental proceedings against the petitioner under the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1970 under Rule 8 for imposition of the major punishment. Thereafter without there being any official chargesheet served upon the petitioner, the respondents passed an order on 29.07.2019 i.e. after a period of 3 months of suspension of the petitioner dismissing the petitioner from service by invoking power under Rule 5, Rule 13 (ii) of the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1970 read with Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India.

2.3 Without initiating any disciplinary proceedings, the petitioner was dismissed from service vide impugned order dated 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) by placing reliance upon the video clip which was circulated coupled with the complaint submitted by the local MLA dated 31.05.2019 holding that the video clip circulated on media along with the complaint by local MLA confirming the said incident was sufficient to hold that the petitioner has indulged in corrupt practices while performing his official duties and that there was no need for further enquiry in light of the same thereby holding the petitioner (since deceased) liable for exemplary punishment of dismissal.

3. Upon notice of motion, the respondent-State has filed its reply. In the reply, it has been stated that the petitioner was placed under suspension vide order dated 25.04.2019 keeping in view the newspaper report dated 25.04.2019 coupled with the video clip circulated on 24.04.2019. It has been mentioned in the reply that keeping in view the said video clip, which has been deemed to be true on account of the same having been forwarded by the Labour Commissioner and the fact that the petitioner had repeatedly apologised for his conduct in the said video coupled with the complaint by the local MLA on 31.05.2019, there was no further need of enquiry into the allegations and the order dated 29.07.2019 was passed dismissing the petitioner from service under Rule 13 (ii) of the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1970 Rules read with Article 311 (2) of the Constitution of India.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that as the petitioner was serving on extension of one year, therefore keeping in view

the fact that very less time was left for conduct of a proper enquiry and the contract of extension in service of the petitioner (since deceased) was about to come to an end, the Department did not find it not feasible to hold the enquiry into the allegations alleged against the petitioner as otherwise the petitioner would have retired before such enquiry could have been concluded.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State further submits that an opportunity of hearing was granted to the petitioner on 17.05.2019 and keeping in view the said hearing, no further enquiry was required to be done and the order of punishment of dismissal of the petitioner was passed, which is perfectly legal and valid and is in consonance with the 1970 Rules read with Article 311 (2) Proviso (b) of the Constitution of India.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent further submits that the petitioner was posted at Chandigarh whereas in the video clip, the petitioner is found to be at Ludhiana, hence it can be safely assumed that the petitioner was guilty of the allegations being alleged in the said video clip as nothing has come on record that the petitioner ever got his station leave sanctioned from the department so as to leave Chandigarh to go to Ludhiana.

7. Learned counsel for the respondent further submits that no procedural flaw has been pointed by the learned counsel for the petitioner so as to challenge the impugned order of dismissal of the opportunity of hearing was granted to the petitioner before the passing of the order dismissing the petitioner from service.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner in regards to the argument qua there being no station leave submits that the station leave of the

petitioner was duly sanctioned by the competent authority which can be verified by the respondent hence, the argument being raised that the petitioner was at Ludhiana without there being a leave is factually incorrect and moreso submits that the presence of the petitioner in Ludhiana even otherwise would not tantamount to him taking a bribe.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the present case with their able assistance.

10. The first question which arises for determination in the present case is whether or not, the process envisaged under the 1970 Rules so as to impose a major punishment upon an employee was followed in the facts and circumstances of the present case i.e. whether the requisites of the 1970 Rules and the provisions of the Constitution of India on the basis of the which the dismissal order of the petitioner (since deceased) was passed were fulfilled or not.

11. It is a conceded position between the parties that any action on the petitioner could have only been taken in accordance with the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1970. Under the said 1970 Rules, a procedure has been laid as to how an employee is to be proceeded departmentally in case of any alleged misconduct against him/her.

12. The punishment of dismissal under the 1970 Rules is a major punishment for which, procedure has been envisaged under Rule 8 of the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1970.

13. As per Rule 8, no order imposing any of the penalties specified under Clause V to IX of Rule 5 shall be made except after holding an enquiry as far as may be in a manner provided in said Rule and Rule 9 or in

the manner provided in the Public Servants (Inquiries) Act, 1850. As per Rule 8 of the 1970 Rules, a chargesheet is to be served upon the employee concerned so as to give him a copy of the article of charges, the statement of imputation of misconduct or misbehaviour and the list of documents and witnesses by which, each article of charge is proposed to be sustained/proved. The Government servant is required to submit the reply to the said chargesheet. Upon the receipt of the reply, the Punishing Authority is to form an opinion as to whether, the enquiry is to be conducted keeping in view the reply filed wherein, the allegations are being disputed by the employee concerned. Further, in case the officer concerned is disputing the allegation, the charges are to be proved by conducting the enquiry and in case, the charges are proved, the enquiry report is to be given to the employee concerned for his/her comments and keeping in view the said comments, the Punishing Authority is to form an opinion as to whether any punishment is to be imposed, if yes, then the order of major punishment to be imposed upon the employee concerned is to be passed.

14. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties does not dispute the said process to be followed keeping in view the 1970 Rules when action is sought to be taken within the ambit of the said 1970 Rules.

15. It may be noticed here that under Rule 13 of 1970 Rules, punishments can be imposed upon an employee directly in case, where the employee is convicted of a criminal charge which reflects upon his conduct or where the punishing authority is satisfied for the reasons to be recorded in writing by it, that it is not reasonably practicable to hold an enquiry in the manner provided in these Rules or where the Governor is satisfied that in the

interest of the security of the State, it is not expedient to hold any enquiry in the manner provided in the Service Rules.

16. It may be noticed that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the Punishing Authority has passed an order dismissing the petitioner from service by invoking Rule 13(2) of 1970 Rules read with Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India and have imposed a major punishment of dismissal from service as is evident from a bare reading of the order of dismissal 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8).

17. The question which arises is whether, the requisites set under Rule 13 (2) of the 1970 Rules and Article 311 (2) of the Constitution of India so as to pass order of punishment without holding the departmental enquiry, were fulfilled or not.

18. In order to dispense with the requisites of holding an enquiry before imposition of any penalty under Rule 13 (2) of the 1970 Rules, the punishing authority has to record reasons in writing as to why it is not reasonably practicable to hold the enquiry as per the requirement of 1970 Rules and only after that the order of punishment is to be passed so as to avoid the process of enquiry envisaged under 1970 Rules.

19. It may be noticed in the present case that the order of dismissal 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8) relies upon the video clipping, which is the basis of the imposition of major punishment upon the petitioner which got circulated on 24.04.2019. The same was also part of the news item on 25.04.2019. The petitioner was suspended immediately keeping in view the said video clip and the news item on 25.04.2019.

20. As per the impugned dismissal order dated 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8), it was on the basis of the said video clip forwarded by the Labour Commissioner and a complaint by the Local MLA on the basis of which, it was made out that the petitioner demand and accepted a bribe of Rs.25000/-. There are no reasons recorded in the said dismissal order as to why it was not possible to check the veracity of the said video clip or the complaint by the Local and for affording the petitioner (since deceased) an opportunity to present his defence in accordance with the due procedure of enquiry under the 1970 Rules. Nothing has come on record that it was a case where, the witnesses or the complainant could not have come forward to depose against the petitioner with regard to the allegation of demanding and accepting the bribe. Rather, after circulation of the video clip on 24.04.2019, the petitioner was suspended and a complaint was also received against the petitioner regarding the incident relating to the circulation of the video clip, which clearly shows that the complaint and the veracity of the video clip could have been easily verified to hold the misconduct against the petitioner before imposing the major punishment of dismissal.

21. It may be noticed that even as of now, it is conceded position that the amount of bribe i.e. Rs.25000/- was not recovered from the petitioner but was recovered from another person. Once, the complainant had filed a complaint subsequent to the incident and it is not the case that the said complainant was not available to depose before the departmental proceedings, merely relying upon a video clip, which was also not submitted by the complainant himself or any affected party and the authenticity of the which video clip was never proved in any manner much less by giving due

opportunity of hearing to the petitioner to rebut the presumption qua the said video clip, which was made the basis to impose major punishment of dismissal. No valid reason to dispense with the enquiry in terms of Rule 13 (2) of 1970 Rules was recorded in the dismissal order.

22. Once, the video clip and the complainant both were available, the authenticity of the video clip could have been got verified from the Forensic Department, which action was not taken by the Department in the period of 3 months, which is the period from the date of suspension and the date of dismissal order hence, the decision of the Punishing Authority to place reliance on Rule 13 so as to dispense with Departmental Enquiry in the facts and circumstances of the present case, is not proper and is arbitrary.

23. Further though the dismissal order placed reliance on Rule 13(2) of the 1970 Rules according to which where it is not practicable to hold an enquiry action can be taken to dispense the enquiry no reason to dispense the enquiry were recorded in the said dismissal order which was a necessary requisite. Rather the stand taken by the punishing authority is that no further enquiry was required to be done in the facts and circumstances of the said case having placed reliance on the video clip and the complaint by the Local MLA. This shows that the respondents were of the view that they had sufficient material to conclude that petitioner was guilty of the allegations. It may be noticed here that exercise of the power to impose punishment under Rule 13 (2) of 1970 Rules is incumbent upon there being practical limitation for conduct of proper enquiry and not on the satisfaction of the punishing authority having sufficient material to conclude the guilt of the employee without undertaking the proper channel of enquiry.

24. In the context as to whether, the petitioner was given due opportunity of hearing to defend himself before issuance of the said dismissal order dated 29.07.2019 (Annexure P-8), nothing has come on record to show that the petitioner was served with the proper chargesheet articulating the charges, evidence and the contemplated action sought to be taken against him. There is nothing on record to show as to whether the “so called” enquiry done by the respondents, which is being treated as sufficient enquiry, was as per 1970 Rules whereunder, the petitioner was afforded the due opportunity to defend his case. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the respondents themselves are not saying that the enquiry was not practicable to be held but are saying that the enquiry which they have done, is sufficient enough to hold the petitioner guilty. Hence, the reasons been given to dispense with the enquiry by invoking power are not available under Rule 13 of the 1970 Rules or/and under 311 (2) of the Constitution of India are not available within the ambit of the said provisions. In the impugned order, it is not the case of the respondents themselves that the enquiry is reasonably impracticable but the respondents are citing the reason that no further enquiry is needed in the matter, which is not the ground envisaged either under Rule 13 of the 1970 Rules or under 311(2) (b) of the Constitution of India hence, the order dismissing the petitioner from service dated 20.07.2019, is not in consonance with the provisions i.e. Rule 13 of the 1970 Rules or Article 311 (2) (b) so as to be upheld.

25. Learned counsel for the respondent-State conceded that as per the record, there is nothing to show that the process envisaged under Rule 8 of the 1970 Rules has been followed. That being so, any order passed

imposing major punishment which is not in consonance with the Rule 8 of the 1970 Rules, cannot be upheld especially when the respondents have failed to satisfy this Court that the present case was such that it was not reasonably practicable to hold the enquiry, which is the only reason available to invoke jurisdiction under Rule 13 of the 1970 Rules.

26. The other argument which has been taken by the learned counsel for the respondent-State is that the punishing authority also exercised the powers under Article 311 (2) of the Constitution of India, which is reproduced hereunder:-

“(2)No such person as aforesaid shall be dismissed or removed or reduced in rank except after an enquiry in which he has been informed of the charges against him and given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in respect of those charge.

Provided that where it is proposed after such enquiry, to impose upon him any such penalty, such penalty may be imposed on the basis of the evidence adduced during such enquiry and it shall not be necessary to give such person any opportunity of making representation on the penalty proposed.

Provided further that this clause shall not apply—

(a)where a person is dismissed or removed or reduced in rank on the ground of conduct which has led to his conviction on a criminal charge; or

(b)where the authority empowered to dismiss or remove a person or to reduce him in rank is satisfied that for some reason, to be recorded by that authority in writing, it is not reasonably practicable to hold such enquiry; or

(c)where the President or the Governor, as the case may be, is satisfied that in the interest of the security of the State, it is not expedient to hold such enquiry.”

27. A bare perusal of the above reproduction would show that grounds available under Article 311 (2) are also the same, which have been made part of Rule 13 (2) of the 1970 Rules. Once, the Article 311 (2) and Rule 13 (2) of the 1970 Rules are similarly worded and as the applicability

of Rule 13(2) of 1970 Rules has already been dealt with hereinbefore, to come to the conclusion that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the decision of the respondent-State that they had already conducted the enquiry and there was no need of further enquiry was not in consonance with the Rule 13 (2) of 1970 Rules, the same is to be read qua the argument raised with respect to application of Article 311 (2) which has been relied upon by the respondent-State.

28. The question of law that under what circumstances, the disciplinary proceedings can be dispensed with without holding an enquiry, has already been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India more than once in ***Civil Appeal No.10587 of 1983 titled as "Jaswant Singh v. State of Punjab and others"***, ***decided on 27.11.1990***. The relevant paragraph of the said judgment is as under:-

"4. Article 310 of our Constitution which engrafts the pleasure doctrine of the English common law is, however, qualified by the opening words except as expressly provided by this Constitution. Article 311 is one such express provision. According to Clause (1) thereof, a person who is a member of a civil service cannot be dismissed or removed from service by an authority subordinate to that by which he was appointed. Clause (2) next provides that no such person shall be dismissed or removed or reduced in rank except after an enquiry in which he has been informed of the charges against him and given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in respect of those charges. Then comes the first proviso with which we are not concerned. The second proviso has three clauses but we are concerned with clause (b) only. Clause (b) of that second proviso reads as under:

Provided further that this clause shall not apply.

(b) where the authority empowered to dismiss or remove a person or to reduce him in rank is satisfied that for some reason, to be recorded by that authority in writing, it is not reasonably practicable to hold such enquiry."

Thus the English doctrine incorporated in Article 310 which is qualified by the opening words "except as expressly provided by this Constitution" is subject to Article 311(1) and (2) which contains safeguards against termination from service. However, the second proviso to Article 311 (2) is again in the nature of an exception and lays down that in cases cataloged in Clauses (3), (b) and (c) thereof the requirement of an enquiry can be dispensed with. The scope of Articles 310 and 311 of the Constitution was examined by this Court in Union of India v. Talsi Ram Patel, 1985 (Suppl) 2 SCK 131, wherein by majority of this Court held that once the requirements of the relevant clause of the second proviso are satisfied, the services of a civil servant can be terminated without foilovring the audi alteram partem rule. It was held that since the requirement of Article 311 (2) was expressly excluded by the second proviso, there was no question of introducing the same by the back door. On this line of reasoning, the majority held that Divisional Personnel Officer Southern Railway v. T. R. Challappan, (1976)1 SCR 783 was not correctly decided. It, therefore, took the view that it is not necessary to offer a hearing to the civil servant even on the limited question of punishment.XXX.

5. XXX. It was incumbent on the respondents to disclose to the Court the material in existence at the date-of the passing of the impugned order in support of the subjective satisfaction recorded by respondent No. 3 in the impugned order. Clause (b) if the second proviso to Article 311 (2) can be invoked only when the authority is satisfied from the material placed before him that it is not reasonably practicable to hold a departmental enquiry. This is clear from the following observation at p. 270 of Tuls Ram's case:

"A disciplinary authority is not expected to dispense with a disciplinary authority lightly or arbitrarily or out of ulterior motives or merely in order to avoid the holding of an enquiry or because the Department's case against the Government servant is weak and must fail."

The decision to dispense with the departmental enquiry cannot, therefore, be rested solely on the ipse dixit of the concerned authority. When the satisfaction of the concerned authority is questioned in a Court of law, it is incumbent on those who support the order to show that the satisfaction is based on certain objective facts and is not the outcome of the whim or caprice of the concerned officer. XXX"

29. A bare perusal of the above reproduction would show that where the Punishing Authority is satisfied from the material on record that it is not reasonably practicable to hold the departmental enquiry, the enquiry can be dispensed with. The authority is not expected to dispense with the enquiry lightly or arbitrarily or with an ulterior motive or merely in order to avoid the process of holding of an enquiry or because the department's case against the Government Servant might fail, as per the settled principle of law noticed hereinbefore. It will be relevant to reproduce Paragraph 8 of the impugned order dismissing the petitioner from service so that the applicability of the judgment in ***Jaswant Singh's case (supra)***, can be noticed.

"Whereas, after thorough examination and consideration of facts on record, it is clear that the offence of Sh. M.P. Beri, Additional Director of Factories (now under suspension) is very grievous and put a blot on the working of the State Government. The menace of corruption has eroded the authority of the State and people's belief in the Welfare State. From the facts, it is clear that there is no need of further

enquiry as his conduct has made him liable to be given an exemplary punishment. Therefore, it is decided to dismiss Sh. M.P. Beri, Additional Director of Factories from service under rule 5 and rule 13(ii) of Punjab Civil Services (Punishment & Appeal) Rules, 1970 read with Article 311 (2) of the Constitution of India”

30. A bare perusal of the above would show that the valid reasons to dispense with the enquiry, which have been enumerated by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India are not present in the facts and circumstances of the present case. Nothing has come on record in the order passed, wherein the reasons have been given to dispense with the enquiry so as to pass the order of dismissal that the same was not reasonably practicable or practicable. Rather, the reasons given by the respondents are that the charges have been proved. The reason given by the respondent-State is not available so as to dispense with the enquiry under Rule 13 of the 1970 Rules or under Article 311 (2) (b) of the Constitution of India. The order shows that the main purpose to invoke the jurisdiction is to do away with the enquiry proceedings so as to impose the punishment upon the petitioner as early as possible and the set him an example for others and that too by recording that the allegations against the petitioner stands proved despite the fact that the video clip never got authenticated/proved at any stage before the impugned order of dismissal order was passed against the petition.

31. A bare perusal of the reasons given by the respondent reproduced hereinbefore would show that it is not the case where the punishing authority is submitting that keeping in view the status of the

petitioner or the nature of allegations, nobody will come forward to depose against the petitioner.

32. It is only under those circumstances, where the Department is of the view that there are serious allegations and nobody will come forward to depose against the petitioner, the enquiry proceedings against the petitioner could have been dispensed with under 1970 Rule or under 311 (2) (b) of the Constitution of India whereas, the punishing authority, in the present case is of the view that no further enquiry is needed to mean that the respondents in their own mind have concluded that the petitioner is guilty without even following the process of issuing him a chargesheet. Hence, keeping in view the settled principle of law in *Jaswant Singh's case (supra)*, in the present case, invoking the power under Rule 13 (2) of the 1970 Rules or 311(2) (b) of the Constitution of India is incorrect and is not made out.

33. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the petitioner was on extension and he was about to retire and in case he would have retired, Department could not have taken action against them hence, the Department decided not to conduct the enquiry as envisaged under Rule 8 of the 1970 Rules and passed the impugned order of dismissal.

34. It may be noticed that the allegations were alleged against the petitioner on 24.04.2019 however, the petitioner was to retire on 31.03.2020. There were 11 months before the petitioner was to retire. Once, the allegations were before the Department on 24.04.2019 and the petitioner was suspended also. Nothing stopped the Department to issue the petitioner a chargesheet, hold the enquiry and prove the allegations especially when, the

complaint was made after the circulation of the said video clip by the MLA concerned.

35. Facts of the present case proved that it is not a case that there were no witnesses who could have been examined or witnesses refused to support the allegations alleged against the petitioner. Rather, after the incident, the complaint was filed which shows that in case the enquiry had been held, the complainant could have been examined by the petitioner during the said enquiry so as to bring out his side of the story also.

36. That being so, the arguments that there was no sufficient time left to conduct the enquiry in the present case so as to straightaway impose the punishment, cannot be held to be a valid ground so as to dispense with the enquiry especially when said ground is not available under 1970 Rules or even under Article 311 of the Constitution of India.

37. Keeping in view the above, the order of punishment passed against the petitioner dismissing him from service, cannot be held to be valid or in consonance with the 1970 Rules or Article 311 of Constitution of India. The petitioner has been prejudiced in his defence as, respondents have concluded the allegations as “proved” on their own without being any valid evidence, or giving due opportunity to the petitioner to rebut the same as per the procedure envisaged under 1970 Rules. The order dated 29.07.2019 dismissing the petitioner from service is set aside.

38. Though, the Department would have been given a fresh chance to conduct the enquiry against the petitioner but as unfortunately, the petitioner has already passed away, there cannot be any enquiry against the petitioner at this stage.

39. That being so, the petitioner will be treated in service upto the date of the termination order and will be deemed to have retired from service from the date of dismissal i.e. 29.07.2019 whatever the benefit, the petitioner is entitled for keeping in view the service he has rendered upto the said date, will be given to the petitioner by treating him having retired on the said date.

40. Let, the respondents calculate the benefits which the petitioner is entitled for keeping in view the service rendered by him including his pensionary benefits, pension upto the date of his death and the same be released to the widow of the petitioner who has already been brought on record as a Legal Representative of the petitioner.

41. After the death of the petitioner, the widow of the petitioner will also be entitled for family pension from the date the petitioner died. The widow be also given the benefit of family pension starting from the date of death of the petitioner along with arrears upto and she will continue to get the family pension till she is alive or remains.

42. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was suffering from Cancer and had undergone treatment for which the medical reimbursement bills were generated but the same have not been dealt with as the petitioner was dismissed from service but as of now, the said dismissal order has been set aside, the respondents be directed to consider the medical bills submitted by the petitioner for the reimbursement of the same.

43. Learned State counsel submits that in case, any of the medical bills of the petitioner are still pending consideration with the authorities

concerned, keeping in view that dismissal of the petitioner from service has been set aside, appropriate order on the same will be passed within a period of 8 weeks from the receipt of copy of this order and in case it is found that the petitioner is entitled for the reimbursement of any medical bill, the same will also to be done in favour of the petitioner to be released to the widow of the petitioner.

44. No other arguments is raised.
45. Present petition is allowed in above terms.
46. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

12-12-2024
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES/NO
Whether reportable: YES/NO