



CWP- 11202-2025

-1-

121

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

**CWP- 11202-2025**

**Date of Decision: 25.04.2025**

NITYA NAND YADAV

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Malik, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)**

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the first respondent to decide the petitioner's representation dated 02.01.2025, Annexure P-13, in a time bound manner and take action against the erring official/retired Principal Naresh Kumar/fourth respondent.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was working as Associate Professor in Mathematics when he represented against denial of powers as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in the College. In response to information sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005, he was informed that as per Annual Confidential Report (ACR) for the year 2018-19, his integrity has been assessed as doubtful; it was conveyed to him vide letter dated 27.07.2021. He objected to the same, and vide order dated



CWP- 11202-2025

-2-

24.01.2024, Annexure P-9, the adverse remarks were expunged by the competent authority. Thereafter, the petitioner has been making representations for taking action against the said Principal/fourth respondent who recorded adverse remarks in his ACR for the year 2018-19, but no action has been taken by the Department. It is prayed that his latest representation, dated 02.01.2025, in this regard may be ordered to be decided within a specified period. It has also been contended that the fourth respondent was not the competent authority to record adverse remarks against the petitioner because he had not seen/observed the latter's work and conduct for the minimum requisite period of three months.

3. It remains undisputed that adverse remarks recorded against the petitioner in ACR 2018-19 already stand expunged. In case there is any misconduct or wrong committed by the fourth respondent in recording of the ACR, it is for the employer/Government to take action, if deemed appropriate. So far as the petitioner is concerned, he does not have any *locus standi* to approach this Court for initiation of disciplinary action against the fourth respondent. His urge to seek such an action is driven by self-interest and personal vendetta for which a writ of *mandamus* cannot be issued.

4. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition and it stands dismissed.

25.04.2025  
Sima

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)  
JUDGE

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |