



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

205

**CWP-4877-2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.11.2025**

SUNIL KUMAR

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. D.P.S. Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 20.02.2015 whereby his revision petition was dismissed by Director General of Police (in short 'DGP').

2. The petitioner is working with respondent as Constable. He was implicated in FIR No.202 dated 19.12.2011 registered at Police Station Sadar Narwana under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 435 and 479 of IPC. He was dismissed from service on account of aforesaid FIR. He preferred an appeal before Appellate Authority which vide order dated 12.03.2014 converted his punishment into forfeiture of 7

increments with permanent effect. He came to be acquitted by trial Court vide judgment dated 05.06.2014. He preferred revision petition on 23.06.2014 before DGP. The revision petition was filed in terms of Rule 16.32 of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (in short 'PPR'). As per Rule 16.32 of PPR, revision petition may be filed within 30 days from the date of receipt of order of Appellate Authority. The Revisionary Authority dismissed revision petition of the petitioner on the ground of delay. There was delay of 2 months and 11 days in filing revision.

3. Learned State counsel submits that there was delay in filing revision petition, thus, DGP rightly dismissed the same. He expressed his inability to controvert that Revisionary Authority has power to condone delay and in the instant case petitioner was acquitted by trial Court. The judgment of acquittal was passed after appellate order.

4. From the perusal of record, it is evident that petitioner was acquitted vide judgment dated 05.06.2014. The Appellate Authority passed order on 12.03.2014. He preferred revision on 23.06.2014. There was delay of 2 months and 11 days. Said delay was not inordinate. The foundation of punishment was petitioner's involvement in criminal case. He was acquitted by trial Court. He preferred revision within 30 days from the date of acquittal, thus, DGP was supposed to consider his case on merits instead of dismissing on the ground of delay which was not exorbitant.

5. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly allowed. The impugned order dated 20.02.2015 is hereby set aside. The matter is remanded back to DGP to pass fresh order on merit.
6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

November 10, 2025
Deepak DPA

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