
Jaipal
State of Haryana and Others

Versus

...Petitioner
...Respondents

And

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner(s)	Respondent(s)
2.	CWP-20800-2020 (O&M)	Jaipal	State of Haryana and Others
3.	CWP-20805-2020 (O&M)	Jaipal	State of Haryana and Others

Present:- Dr. S.K. Redhu, Advocate for the petitioner (Through VC).
Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-12937-2020.**

“It is the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in judicial custody in a criminal case, which has been registered against him because of which he is unable to participate in the departmental enquiry, which has been initiated against him vide order dated 07.05.2020 (Annexure P-4). He, therefore, contends that the proceedings of second departmental enquiry be kept in abeyance. Counsel for the petitioner has also placed reliance on the challenge made by him to the earlier departmental enquiry in Civil Writ Petition No.12140 of 2020

titled as Jaipal Vs. State of Haryana and others, in which notice of motion has been issued by this Court for today. However, in the said writ petition, no reply has been filed.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms.Kirti Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

Reply to the writ petition be filed within a period of five weeks with an advance copy to counsel opposite.

Replication, if any, be filed prior to the next date of hearing.

*List on **02.11.2020** alongwith Civil Writ Petition No.12140 of 2020.*

In the meanwhile, departmental proceedings initiated against the petitioner vide order dated 07.05.2020 (Annexure P-4) be kept in abeyance.”

3. Dr. S.K. Redhu, Advocate submits that petitioner has retired on attaining the age of superannuation. He was wrongly implicated in criminal cases. The jurisdictional Superintendent of Police (SP) was biased which resulted in registration of many criminal cases against him.

4. In the wake of judgment dated 13.05.2025 passed by this Court in a bunch of petitions including **CWP No.15246 of 2022** titled as ‘**Narender Kumar Versus State of Haryana and others**’, the petitions are disposed of with liberty to respondent to proceed with departmental proceedings in accordance with law.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

13.08.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No