



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

CWP-2947-2025

Date of Decision : 24.03.2025

JITENDER MANDAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Atul Ravish, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajvir Singh Sihag, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

Mr. Pardeep Solath, Advocate
for respondent no.3.

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 issuance of a *mandamus* upon respondents no.1 and 2, to transfer respondent no.3, to any other district in the State of Haryana, during the pendency of the vigilance enquiry against her.

2. Succinctly, the prayer made in the instant petition, is based upon a complaint, pending enquiry against respondent no.3, who is working as a General Manager, District Co-operative Bank (DCCB), Karnal, for committing scam of crores of rupees in the name of installing wooden racks at the warehouse of the cooperative societies, without inviting any tender, and further for earning huge commission on the same.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since respondent no.3 is sitting on the helm of the affair, she may tamper with the documentary evidence as well as influence the witnesses who are in fact working under her office.

4. This Court vide order dated 20.02.2025, without issuing notice of motion, directed the learned State counsel to have apt instructions from the quarter concerned, as to whether, any evidence, documentary or oral, are within the control of respondent no.3.

5. Today Mr.Rajvir Singh Sihag, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of respondent No.2, through a validly executed power of attorney in his favour. The same is taken on record. The respondent no.2 is the apex authority in the hierarchy of the co-operative credit societies, within the State of Haryana.

6. He informs this Court that the issue in the instant matter relates to the embezzlement in the primary societies and the bank is only an instrument to disburse the amount. He further submits that a vigilance enquiry in this regard about to be completed, as per the information provided to him by the authority concerned. He also submits that he does not have any objection in case a *mandamus* is passed upon respondent no.2 to decide the representation (Annexure P-5) of petitioner.

7. Without observing anything, at this stage, regarding the allegations, as levelled by the petitioner in the instant petition, this Court passes a *mandamus* upon respondent no.2 to decide the representation (Annexure P-5), so preferred by the petitioner, preferably within one month from today.

8. It goes without saying that the aforesaid exercise shall be conducted after giving an adequate opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned.

9. **Disposed of** accordingly.

March 24, 2025
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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