



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

CWP-15497-2008

Date of Decision: 28.07.2025

Ranbir Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Sudhir Sharma and Mr. Rahul Dhanda, Advocates,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Suneel Ranga, DAG, 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:

(i) order dated 27.01.2006 whereby he was dismissed from service;

ii) order dated 28.08.2006 whereby his appeal was dismissed; and

(iii) order dated 06.02.2007 whereby his revision was also dismissed.

2. The petitioner joined Haryana Police Force as Constable on 22.04.1973. He was promoted from time to time. He was promoted as Head Constable on 11.04.1983 and as ASI on 23.04.1995. Two FIRs came to be registered against him in February' 2002 i.e. FIR No. 86 dated 22.01.2002 under Sections 331, 342 IPC and under Sections 7, 49 and 88 of P.C. Act and FIR No.155 dated 07.02.2002 under Sections 7, 49 and 88 of P.C. Act at Police Station City Palwal. He was convicted



by Trial Court in both the FIRs. On account of his conviction, he was dismissed from service vide order dated 27.01.2006. He unsuccessfully preferred appeal before Appellate Authority and Revision before DGP. He preferred Crl. Appeal No. 1180-SB of 2004 and Crl. Appeal No. 1345-SB of 2005 against judgment of conviction. His sentence was suspended by this Court. He was acquitted vide judgments dated 20.11.2018 passed in Crl. Appeal No. 1180-SB of 2004 and Crl. Appeal No. 1345-SB of 2005.

3. Mr. Suneel Ranga, DAG, Haryana submits that petitioner was dismissed from service because he was convicted by Trial Court. As per Rule 16.2 of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as made applicable to State of Haryana) (in short 'PPR'), the respondent was bound to dismiss the petitioner from service.

4. On being confronted with Rule 16.3 of PPR as well as order dated 02.04.2025 passed by this Court in ***CWP-18777-2023, Bala Singh vs. State of Haryana and others***; order dated 21.05.2025 passed in ***CWP-21304-2024, Nirmaljit Singh vs. State of Punjab and others*** and order dated 27.05.2025 passed in ***CWP-25411-2022, Dheeraj Kumar vs. State of Haryana and others***, Mr. Suneel Ranga expressed his inability to controvert the fact that case of petitioner needs to be reconsidered in the light of judgment of acquittal.

5. In the light of orders passed in ***Bala Singh (Supra)***, ***Nirmaljit Singh (Supra)*** and ***Dheeraj Kumar (Supra)*** as well as Rule 16.3 of PPR, the impugned orders are hereby set aside and respondents are directed to pass fresh order in terms of Rule 16.3 of PPR. If the petitioner is found entitled to reinstatement, his claim for salary and



arrears would be decided in accordance with applicable Rules. The needful shall be done within 3 months. If petitioner is found eligible to salary and other dues, the payment shall be made within 3 months thereafter. The said payment shall not carry interest if made within aforesaid period, failing which respondent would be liable to pay interest @ 6% p.a. from the expiry of said period.

6. Allowed in above terms.

7. After dictation of judgment, learned counsel for the parties pointed out that petitioner has passed away and his wife is alive. The petitioner's wife would be bound to submit requisite papers within one month from today.

28.07.2025
shivani

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable

Yes
No