

2024.PHHC.131733



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

**257-1**

**CWP-22268-2022**  
**Date of Decision: 03.10.2024**

**NEERAJ SHARMA**

... Petitioner

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Chanchal K. Singla, Advocate and  
Ms. Tarranum Madan, Advocate for  
the petitioner in CWP-22268-2022.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Haryana  
for respondents No.1, 2, 5 and 6.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Advocate  
for respondent No.3.

\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in the present petition is for directing the respondents to conclude the State Vigilance Investigation No.5 dated 26.04.2019, in a time bound manner, pertaining to illegalities and corrupt practices in allotment and execution of tender for widening the road and construction of drain roads and construction of drain, central verge from Bodh Vihar Chowk to ITI, ITI to Neelam Chowk, Neelam Chowk to Hardware Chowk and Hardware Chowk to Bodh Vihar Chowk, NIT, Faridabad.

Learned State Counsel refers to the reply filed on behalf of respondent No.2 by way of an affidavit of Seshan Balasubramony, Superintendent of Police, State Vigilance Bureau, Faridabad (the said officer



has been engaged on contract basis and is not competent to file any such response on behalf of the State Government). This Court was inclined to impose heavy costs on such misconduct on the part of the Senior Functionaries of the State, but at the insistence of the learned State Counsel, the costs is waived off. The office of Advocate General, Haryana as well as State Vigilance Bureau are directed to be careful in the matters of filing replies henceforth.

It is averred that State Vigilance Investigation No.5 dated 26.04.2019 is the same as State Vigilance Investigation No.6 dated 10.05.2019 and that conducting of two parallel inquiry/investigation on the same set of allegations, was not legally tenable. Hence, a letter bearing No.13 dated 05.01.2021 was sent by the Superintendent of Police, State Vigilance Bureau Faridabad to the Director General, State Vigilance Bureau regarding cancellation of State Vigilance Investigation No.5 dated 26.04.2019. Accordingly, vide order dated 22.04.2021, the State Vigilance Investigation No.5 dated 26.04.2019 was ordered to be cancelled and State Vigilance Investigation No.6 dated 10.05.2019 was directed to be continued. It is contended that inquiry in the said matter has already been concluded and FIR No.11 dated 24.03.2022 has already been registered under Sections 166, 167, 218 and 120-B of IPC and Section 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. It is averred that after registration of the FIR, certain proceedings were stated to be initiated by the persons aggrieved of the grant of Sanction under Section 17 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. He, however, on instructions from Inspector Sant Ram, Office of ACB,



CWP-22268-2022

-3-

Faridabad contends that so far as the prayer made in the present writ petition is concerned, the same already stands answered and the present writ petition has become infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute or controvert the same.

Disposed of as having been rendered infructuous, without prejudice to the other rights of the petitioner, if any.

OCTOBER 03, 2024  
rajender

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

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