



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

**CWP-1051-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.07.2025**

Meena Kumari

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate for
Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 02.10.2022 (Annexure P-4) whereby she has been discharged from service.

2. The petitioner was appointed as SPO vide order dated 21.07.2017. By said order 50 persons were appointed as SPO. She came to be discharged vide order dated 02.10.2022 (Annexure P-4). The said order was passed on the basis of complaint lodged by her husband to Chief Minister. It is apt to notice here that petitioner lodged FIR under Section 376 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 against her father-in-law. The respondent recalled discharge order dated 02.10.2022 by order dated 20.12.2022. She again came to be discharged vide order dated 21.12.2022.

3. Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate submits that petitioner was discharged without any reason. Husband of the petitioner appeared before the Home Minister and on the direction of the Home Minister, the

respondent without application of mind passed impugned order. There was no reason to dispense with services of the petitioner.

4. Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana submits that petitioner was appointed as SPO. The post of SPO is a temporary post. The department is not required to hold regular departmental enquiry. The petitioner lodged FIR under Section 376 IPC against her father-in-law who later on passed away. There are allegations against the petitioner that she attacked her in-laws and they lodged FIR under Section 323 IPC against her. Police has filed its report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. against the petitioner. Matter is pending before the trial Court. Charges stand framed.

5. The petitioner was not a regular employee and was holding post of SPO. She lodged FIR under Section 376 against her father-in-law who passed away after filing of police report. There is FIR against her under Section 323 IPC. The respondent formed an opinion that petitioner was misusing her position.

6 Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its writ jurisdiction under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed.

7. This order would not inhibit the respondent to consider the petitioner for the post of SPO if she is acquitted in FIR lodged against her. Original record is returned to learned State counsel.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

09.07.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No