



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

**CWP No.29903 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.12.2024**

Rajesh Yadav

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present:- Mr. Kshitij Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.


Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana for the respondents.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution, *inter alia*, for directing respondent No.2, to decide and communicate the decision on the basis of representation dated 19.06.2023 (P-4), submitted by the petitioner.

(2) Although, there is no formal notice of motion; but in compliance of the order dated 06.11.2024 of this Court, learned State Counsel has produced the copy of order dated 09.12.2024, passed by Director General of Police, Haryana, which is taken on record as Mark 'X' and para 4 of the same reads as under:-

“ The representationist was heard in person through webex video conferencing on 04.12.2024. After going through the representation, comments received from the Reporting Authority and the relevant records, it is revealed that the



departmental enquiry initiated against the representationist vide order dated 16.04.2014 has been filed by SP/Palwal vide order dated 22.08.2014. Moreover, the remarks recorded in Column No. 17 of ACR of the representationist are not adverse, but only the fact about a pending departmental enquiry is mentioned therein. No representation lies against facts mentioned in the ACR of the representationist in Column No. 17. It is pertinent to mention that no other column in ACR for the period from 01.04.2014 to 04.07.2014 of the representationist has been adversely remarked and overall grading is also 'Good'. Hence, there is no requirement to expunge the fact mentioned in Column No. 17 of ACR of the representationist under report. However, Secret Steno, PHQ shall mention in Column No. 17 of ACR for the period under report that the departmental enquiry initiated vide order dated 22.08.2014 against the representationist has been filed. Representation submitted by the representationist is decided accordingly.”

(3) A perusal of the above extract reveals that there is no adverse remark against the petitioner in Column No.17 of the ACR for the period w.e.f. 01.04.2014 to 04.07.2014; rather overall grading has been recorded as “Good”.

(4) In view of the above, learned Counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submits that this petition be disposed off as not pressed “at this stage”.

(5) Ordered accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

10th December, 2024
Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No