

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

2025:PHHC:078988



**CWP No. 17958 of 2025
Date of Decision: 04.07.2025**

Rajbir Singh

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Ravinder Malik (Ravi), Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 5

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 29.05.2023 (Annexure P-1A) whereby he was placed under Suspension.

2. The petitioner joined respondent-Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam as ALM on 29.10.1997. He came to be implicated in FIR No. 401 dated 19.05.2023, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, registered at Police Station Yamunanagar City, Yamunanagar, Haryana. He was arrested on 05.07.2023 and placed under suspension vide order dated 29.05.2023. The respondents initiated departmental proceedings against him. For the said purpose, charge-sheet was served upon him. An Enquiry



Officer was appointed vide order dated 19.12.2024. The petitioner has been released on bail, however, he has not been reinstated.

3. Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate submits that co-accused who were also arrested have already been reinstated. The departmental proceedings are kept in abeyance, thus, on the ground of parity petitioner should also be reinstated.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana and Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate, who on advance notice are present in Court, accept notice on behalf of respondent No. 1 and 2 to 5 respectively.

6. On the request of both sides, the petition is taken up for final disposal today itself.

7. Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate submits that petitioner was involved in a serious offence of embezzlement of Rs. 12 Crore. The department has conducted enquiry and he has been found responsible for loss of Rs. 5 Crore. Co-accused who were arrested in aforesaid FIR were not found guilty of embezzlement of funds, thus, they have been reinstated. The petitioner cannot claim parity. The departmental proceedings are in progress.

8. I have heard the arguments and perused the record.

9. The petitioner is claiming that departmental proceedings are kept in abeyance whereas respondents are claiming that proceedings are in progress. The petitioner is claiming that similarly situated co-accused have been reinstated and he has been discriminated. The respondents are claiming



that role of petitioner was serious and he was responsible for loss of Rs. 5 Crore whereas co-accused were not responsible for the loss.

10. Without commenting upon merits of the case, the petition stands disposed of with a direction to respondents to consider representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law.

11. Let the needful be done within three months from today.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

04.07.2025
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No