



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

CWP-12065-2025

Date of Decision:17.09.2025

Darshan Singh Reru

...Petitioner

vs.

Union of India through Secretary
Department of Rural Development and
others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Ms. Harpreet Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned memo No.12/87/2020/NREGA/1168 dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-6), whereby the tenure of the petitioner was extended only upto 06.02.2025. A further prayer has been made to direct the respondents to extend the tenure of petitioner for a period of one year i.e. upto 09.11.2025 as per terms of the appointment as well as the instructions/rules.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was appointed as an Ombudsman on 09.11.2022 (Annexure P-1). As per the appointment letter, the petitioner was appointed for a period of two years extendable not more than twice by one year, based on performance appraisal process or till the incumbent attains the age of 68 years, whichever is earlier. She further contends that on 19.03.2025, the petitioner received an order stating therein that the tenure of the petitioner had been extended only upto

06.02.2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the respondents have laid guidelines regarding the appointment and termination of services of Ombudsman by the State Government and Ombudsman may be terminated by the State Government on getting a report from the Selection Committee, which should be based on appraisal of the performance of Ombudsman. Such recommendation has been made to the Chief Secretary of the State Government, who will be competent to pass an order on the said report submitted by the Selection Committee. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner had performed properly and there was no complaint from any corner against him. Keeping in view his annual performance, he was granted extension for a period of three months and such order of termination of services was illegal. Moreover, while passing the impugned order, para 2.2.12 of the Guidelines on Ombudsman were completely overlooked by the respondents.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that no doubt, the petitioner was initially appointed as Ombudsman for a period of two years on 09.11.2022, but he had completed his tenure on 09.11.2024. He further contends that the meeting of the Selection Committee could not be held at the time of consideration of extension in his service. However, the meeting was later on held on 06.02.2025 and on appraisal of the performance, it was found that a poor performance report was received from Additional Deputy Commissioner (D), Hoshiarpur relating to working of the present petitioner. He further contends that since the petitioner had already working from 09.11.2024 to 06.02.2025, it was decided not to grant the contract extension to the present petitioner, in view of poor performance report submitted by Additional Deputy Commissioner (D), concerned. Consequently, the recommendations were made

to the competent authority to discontinue the services of the present petitioner. Learned State counsel further submits that in the present case, the Chief Secretary had duly authorized the Additional Chief Secretary, Co-operation, Government of Punjab to pass orders on the basis of the report submitted by the Selection Committee. After considering the report of the Committee, the order has been passed by the Competent Authority and there is no illegality in the impugned order passed by the respondents.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
5. In the present case, as per the guidelines laid down by the respondents, the Ombudsman is appointed for a tenure of two years, extendable nor more than twice by one year each, based on a performance appraisal process. In the present case, the appraisal report submitted by Additional Deputy Commissioner (D), concerned has been duly examined by the Selection Committee and it was found that the performance of the petitioner was not upto the mark and a recommendation was made to the competent authority for not renewing the contract of the petitioner. After examining the report of the Selection Committee, the order has been passed by an officer, who was empowered to pass the orders as per guidelines. Thus, there is no illegality in the impugned order (Annexure P-6) and the claim of the petitioner is meritless.
6. In view of the above discussion, the present petition is ordered to be dismissed.

17.09.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No