



CWP-23035-2023

1

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

(107)

CWP-23035-2023

Date of Decision : 08.07.2025

Karamjit Singh Bhullar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. J.S. Thind, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Virk, Advocate and
Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate
for respondent No.4

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a mandamus, upon the respondents, to implement the orders dated 22.11.2022 (Annexure P-5) and 24.11.2022 (Annexure P-3), respectively, issued by the respondent No.1, and further directed the respondent No.3, to dismiss the service of respondent No.4, from the date of his retirement, and register an FIR, under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. Upon notice in the instant petition, status report dated 21.01.2025, by way of short affidavit of Mr. Surinder Singh, Deputy Inspector General of Prisons, Punjab, Office of Additional Director General of Police, Prisons, Punjab, Chandigarh, on behalf of the respondents No.1 and 3, has been filed before this Court.



CWP-23035-2023

2

3. The status report (*supra*), carries a copy of order dated 10.09.2024 (Annexure R-1), as issued by the Govt. of Punjab, wherethrough, the chargesheet No.1/106/2020-1J/892 dated 24.04.2020, pending against the respondent No.4, has been filed and criminal proceedings (if any) initiated against respondent No.4, was also ordered to be closed, merely, on the ground that Punjab Public Service Commission (PPSC), has disagreed with the proposal of punishment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order dated 10.09.2024 (Annexure R-1), as issued by the Govt. of Punjab, is *nonest* and without any jurisdiction. He further submits that without taking into consideration the earlier effective material, which clearly held the respondent No.4, liable not only to face the departmental proceedings, but criminal proceedings as well. Therefore, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that he may be granted liberty to challenge the order (*supra*), at this stage.

5. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **dismissed as withdrawn**, with liberty as aforesaid.

6. Before parting with this order, it is clarifies that the liberty granted by this Court, would not establish the *locus* of the petitioner. It is for the petitioner to establish his *locus*, to challenge the order (*supra*).

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

July 08, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No