



208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-25404-2024

Date of Decision: 24.12.2025

Jitender Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. M.D. Khan, Advocate and
Mr. Ashif, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent not to proceed with departmental inquiry during the pendency of criminal proceedings.

2. On 01.10.2024, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed:

“Petitioner is praying for issuance of direction to not to proceed with the departmental inquiry till the pendency of the criminal trial in case FIR No.357, dated 30.08.2023, under Sections 307, 323 IPC (subsequently converted to Section 302 IPC), registered at P.S. Gadpuri, Dist. Palwal.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that if the departmental inquiry, as indicated in the letter dated 15.09.2023 (P-2) issued by respondent No.3, is progressed, the joining of the same by the petitioner would not be possible, he being inside the jail in the criminal case, on account of the murder of his wife.

*Further contends that continuation of the departmental proceedings would be in violation of spirit of Rule 16.3 of the Punjab Police Rules (as applicable to the Haryana), and also against the law laid down by the Hon’ble Apex Court in **Civil Appeal No.5026 of 1990**, titled as, “**P.J. Sunderrajan vs. Unit Trust of India and others**”, as well as in case of **Capt. M. Paul Anthony vs. Bharat Gold Mines Ltd., 1999(2) SCT 660**.*

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice for the respondent-State and seeks time to get instructions and to file reply, if any.

Let requisites copies of the complete paper book be handed over to the learned State counsel, during the course of the day.

Adjourned to 08.01.2025.

Pleadings be completed meanwhile.”

3. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner stands dismissed vide order dated 31.10.2025, thus, instant petition has rendered infructuous.
4. Learned counsel representing the petitioner does not dispute the aforesaid fact.
5. In the wake of statement of both sides, the instant petition stands **dismissed** as having been rendered infructuous.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

24.12.2025
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No