



CWP-1014-2025

1

121

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

CWP-1014-2025

Date of Decision:07.04.2025

SURENDER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. Abhishek Sirohi, Advocate for
Mr. Dr. Pankaj, Nanhera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. AG, 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 07.03.2023 (Annexure P-6) whereby DGP Haryana dismissed his revision on the ground of delay.

2. The petitioner claims that he actually filed appeal before DGP on 14.07.2017 against order dated 26.06.2017 passed by Appellate Authority. The respondent does not dispute receipt of said appeal.

3. Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. AG, Haryana submits that petitioner initially filed appeal dated 14.07.2017 before DGP and it was not adjudicated because its title was appeal instead of revision. The petitioner later on filed revision which was adjudicated by impugned order and dismissed on the ground of delay.

4. From the perusal of record, it is evident that by impugned



CWP-1014-2025

2

order, DGP has dismissed revision on the ground of delay. The petitioner concededly filed appeal against order of Appellate Authority whereas he was required to title said petition as revision instead of appeal. This Court has noticed in many cases that police officials instead of giving title to their petition as 'Revision' casually titled as 'Appeal' and DGP is also adjudicating as appeal and not revision. In the instant case, DGP did not decide representation of the petitioner on the ground that his petition is titled as appeal whereas it should be revision. In case DGP was of the opinion that nomenclature of the petition should be revision, he was duty bound to intimate the petitioner that he should file revision instead of appeal.

5. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court finds it appropriate to set aside impugned order dated 07.03.2023 (Annexure P-6) and direct the DGP, Haryana to adjudicate appeal dated 14.07.2017 treating it as revision.

6. Let the needful be done within a period of three months from today. The petitioner shall be granted opportunity of hearing before passing final order.

7. Allowed in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

07.04.2025

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No