



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

**150**

**LPA-1662-2025**

Date of Decision : **August 12, 2025**

**ROHTASH SINGH**

.....Appellant

***VERSUS***

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present : Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the appellant.

\*\*\*\*

**ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The controversy raised in the present matter has already been adjudicated by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in LPA No.1806 of 2025, decided on 03.07.2025 wherein this Court held as under:-

“2. The consistent view of this Division Bench has been that in cases where there are two parallel proceedings, namely, departmental as well as criminal, both can continue without being affected by one another, as held by this Court in LPA-1146-2024 titled as “ASI Pawan Kumar vs. State of Haryana and others, decided on 08.05.2024, and earlier view taken by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in LPA-1255-2024 titled as “Tulsi Dass vs. State of Haryana and others”, decided on 22.05.2024.

3. This Court in ASI Pawan Kumar (*supra*), held as under:-

“5. We have carefully considered the submissions and found that the learned Single Judge, has before dealing each case, examined the law governing the issue at length and after having culled out the law as to whether departmental proceedings can be allowed to run concurrently with the criminal proceedings, he has thus examined each case on fact.

*In the present case, we find that the charge sheet issued to the petitioner mentions the following allegations for which the departmental proceedings are required to be conducted namely “demanding bribe and not joining the investigation.*

6. *This Court is satisfied that the said aspect cannot be examined in the criminal case and departmental proceedings therefore, need not be stayed or stalled during the criminal case. The law does not require departmental proceedings otherwise be stayed. In view of the settled law in Capt. M. Paul Antony v. Bharat God Mines Ltd.” reported as 1999(3) SCC 679, the present appeal is dismissed.*

4. *We notice that the learned Single Judge has followed our orders. We therefore, find no reason to interfere with the same.*

5. *Keeping in view above, present appeal stands dismissed.*

6. *All pending applications also stand disposed of accordingly.”*

2. For the reasons recorded in LPA No.1806 of 2025, this Letters Patent Appeal also stands dismissed.

**(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**(ROHIT KAPOOR)**  
**JUDGE**

**August 12, 2025**  
*ajaysharma*

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No