

CWP-7974-2014
CWP-8214-2014

1

2025:PHHC:089744



206

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

**CWP-7974-2014
Date of Decision: 22.07.2025**

JAI KARAN Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS Respondents

2) **CWP-8214-2014**

RISH PALPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA & ORSRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order CWP-7974-2014 and CWP-8214-2014 are disposed of since issues involved in the above captioned petitions and prayer sought are common. With the consent of parties and for the sake of brevity, facts are borrowed from CWP-7974-2014.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of adverse remarks recorded in the ACR for the period from 01.04.2009 to 31.03.2010.

3. The petitioner, during 2009-2010, was working as Exempted Head Constable (for short 'EHC'). The Superintendent of Police, Jind



recorded adverse remarks in his ACR for the period from 01.04.2009 to 31.03.2010. The adverse remarks were communicated to him on 11.09.2010. He preferred representation dated 08.01.2013 (Annexure P-4) against the adverse remarks. The Inspector General of Police, Hisar Range, Hisar rejected his representation on the ground of delay.

4. As per instructions dated 14.08.1987 issued by the State Government, representation against adverse remarks may be filed within 45 days from the date of receipt of letter communicating adverse remarks. The Authority dealing with the representation may condone delay upto three months. The petitioner preferred representation after more than 2 ½ years from the date of receipt of letter communicating adverse remarks. He could not advance any plausible reason for the inordinate delay.

5. On being confronted with aforesaid facts, learned counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to controvert the fact that no reasonable cause was explained by petitioner before IGP for inordinate delay.

6. In view of the fact that there was inordinate delay on the part of petitioner in making representation before higher authorities and there was no explanation for the delay, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere with the impugned order.

7. Dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

22.07.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No