



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

CWP-1497-2025

Date of Decision : **22.01.2025**

AMRIK SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. R.S.Rai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Luvinder Sofat, and Ms. Prachi Gupta, Advocates,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for quashing of the order dated 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-8), passed by respondent no.1, being head of the Vigilance Department, Government of Punjab, vide which one IAS officer has been appointed an investigating officer.

2. For the better understanding of the dispute, the operative part of the order reads as under:-

“ A case F.I.R. No. 52 dated 27.11.2024 was registered by the Vigilance Bureau, Punjab against Sukhcharan Singh, Tehsildar, Tapa, District Barnala under Section 7 of the P.C. Act 1988 as amended by the P.C. (Amendment) Act 2018 at the Police Station, Vigilance Bureau, Patiala, Range Patiala. The Additional Sessions Judge, Barnala has granted bail to the concerned Officer vide order dated 02.01.2025.

2. In this matter, on the application of the Punjab Revenue Officers Association dated 16.12.2024, on the recommendation of the Revenue, Rehabilitation and Disaster Management Minister, Punjab

and with the approval of the competent authority, Shri Krishan Kumar, I.A.S. is appointed as the Inquiry Officer of this case.”

3. On the last date of hearing, this Court had directed the learned State counsel to have instructions, with regard to the order (*supra*), as to whether, it is pertaining to conducting any investigation with regard to an FIR, which is registered at the behest of the petitioner.

4. Today, learned State counsel, on instructions imparted to him by respondent no.1, informs this Court that the inquiry report referred in the impugned order was appointed only with regard to the disciplinary/departmental inquiry on account of irregularities surfaced in the revenue department, and the order (*supra*) has not been passed to interfere into the ongoing criminal investigation, arising out of the FIR registered at the behest of the present petitioner.

5. Considering the aforesaid stand taken by the State Government, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the grievance of the present petitioner has been redressed. Therefore, he does not want to press the instant petition, at this stage.

6. **Dismissed as not pressed**, at this stage.

January 22, 2025

dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No