



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

CWP-1290-2018

Date of Decision: 25.09.2025

Ramesh Chander

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 08.04.2019, the following order was passed:

“After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it is apparent that adverse ACR for the period from 17.11.2016 to 31.03.2017 (Annexure R-1) with regard to “integrity-dishonest” was recorded on account of the chargesheet, which had been issued to the petitioner with the allegation that he had taken bribe of Rs.10,000/- from truck driver in exchange for leaving the truck with the help of Dharamkanta owners.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in this chargesheet, finally vide order dated 29.11.2018, Director General of Police has reduced the punishment to censure. Hence, this adverse entry cannot be made a ground to compulsorily retire the petitioner at the age of 55 years.

Learned State counsel seeks time to produce last 10 ACRs of the petitioner to show that he does not have good record to the extent of 70%.

Adjourned to 28.05.2019.”

2. The aforesaid order was followed by order dated 28.05.2019 which reads as:

“Vide impugned notice dated 22.04.2017 (Annexure

P-11), petitioner has been compulsorily retired from service.

Learned State counsel has not produced last 10 ACRs of the petitioner. However, learned counsel for the petitioner has got information regarding those ACRs under the Right to Information Act, 2005. A perusal of the same shows that from 2004 onwards, there is no adverse ACR with respect to the honesty of petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also informed that vide order dated 29.11.2018, the Director General of Police, Haryana has reduced the punishment of stoppage of three increments to that of 'Censure'.

Admitted.

In the meantime, operation of the impugned order/notice dated 22.04.2017 (Annexure P-11) shall remain stayed.”

3. In view of order dated 28.05.2019, the petitioner remained in service till attaining the age of 58 years. He has retired on attaining the age of 58 years, thus, instant petition has rendered infructuous.
4. The petitioner on account of impugned order dated 22.04.2017 remained out of service till the date of interim order dated 28.05.2019 passed by this Court. He was part of Haryana Police Force and his service was pensionable, thus, he must have received pension which is 50% of last drawn salary. The said period would be counted towards service, however, he shall not be entitled to pay/salary more than he has already received for the said period.
5. **Disposed of.**

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

25.09.2025
Prince Chawla

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