



(202)

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

LPA-1622-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision:- 25.02.2025

Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh through its Registrar
General and another.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Rajinder Singh

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. B.S. Khehar, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate,
for the respondent.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (ORAL)

CM-3474-LPA-2017

For the reasons mentioned therein, the delay of 113 days in filing
the appeal is condoned.

The application stands disposed of.

LPA-1622-2017

1. This appeal is directed against the order dated 13.02.2017 passed
by learned Single Judge allowing the writ petition filed by the petitioner
(respondent herein) questioning the legality and validity of the orders
dated 30.07.2013 (Annexure P-1) and 03.01.2014 (Annexure P-5).

2. The respondent was appointed as Peon on 04.04.2012
on probation for a period of two years in the office of District and Sessions
Court, Palwal. However, his services were dispensed with as no longer
required by the District and Sessions Judge, Palwal vide order

dated 30.07.2013 which ostensibly appears to be innocuous and non-stigmatic. The service appeal preferred by the respondent against the order dated 30.07.2013 was filed by the Registrar General of this Court as being not maintainable and intimation in that regard was sent to the respondent by the District and Sessions Judge, Palwal vide letter/order dated 03.01.2014.

3. The learned Single Judge, while passing the impugned order, found after piercing the veil that the discharge order dated 30.07.2013 was in fact stigmatic for being founded upon a complaint made by the then Civil Judge, Junior Division, Palwal on 30.07.2013 against the respondent who was discharged on the very same day without conducting enquiry into the veracity and authenticity of the allegations.

4. During the course of arguments, it was informed that the respondent has not only been re-instated, but also promoted to the post of Clerk on 10.07.2024 (vide order dated 20.03.2018 in the present case).

5. In view of the above and the subsequent events that have taken place, this Court would not like to enter into merits of the matter of challenge made to the order of the learned Single Judge and, therefore, would like to draw curtains on the controversy to give quietus to the issue which is pending since more than a decade with the observation that the present order would not be cited as a precedent.

6. Accordingly, the appeal stands disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

25.02.2025
Amodh Sharma

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