



CWP-23158-2023 (O&M)

-1-

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

106+258

CWP-23158-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.05.2025

Vinod Kashyap

...Petitioner

Versus

**Chandigarh Industrial and Tourism Development Corporation Limited
and others**

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Raman Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate for respondent Nos.1 and 2

Mr. Deepak Malhotra, Advocate for respondent No.3

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 21.02.2023 (Annexure P-6) whereby he was placed under suspension. He is further seeking setting aside of departmental proceedings alleging embezzlement of funds.

2. The petitioner has already been reinstated, thus, his prayer *qua* setting aside of suspension order has lost its significance. Status of suspension period would certainly be decided by authorities after concluding departmental proceedings.

3. Respondent Nos.1 and 2 in written statement has submitted that a Judicial Officer was appointed as Inquiry Officer who submitted his report on 02.02.2024. As per the said report, Sandeep Kapoor, Senior Manager and the petitioner were equally responsible for issuing the cheque in question. Sandeep Kapoor was more interested in hurriedly getting the cheque issued



from concerned Senior Accountant/Cashier in the absence of the petitioner who later signed the cheque merely on the assumption that it was already signed by Sandeep Kapoor.

4. Mr. Madhu Dayal, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 submits that departmental proceedings are kept in abeyance on account of interim order passed by this Court. The moment petition is disposed of, the respondent would proceed against the petitioner as well as Sandeep Kapoor in accordance with law. A show cause notice has already been issued to Sandeep Kapoor on the basis of inquiry report. There would be no discrimination with the petitioner *vis-à-vis* Sandeep Kapoor. Both would be awarded punishment, if any, according to their role and in accordance with law.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is going to retire, thus, respondent may be directed to expedite the proceedings.

6. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 assures the Court that competent authority would pass an appropriate order within one month from the date of filing reply to inquiry report/show cause notice.

7. In the wake of statement of both sides, the present petition stands disposed of.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

21.05.2025
Mohit Kumar

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