

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CM-18396-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP-29129-2024 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 09.12.2025

RK SINGLA

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. J.S.Rana, Advocate for
Mr. S.K.Malik, Advocate the petitioner(s)

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

CM-18396-CWP-2025

This application has been filed for fixing of some actual date of hearing in the main petition.

Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that due to ill health the petitioner could not argue the matter earlier and now the petitioner has regained the health.

However, a perusal of the previous orders depicts that learned counsel for the petitioner sought time to argue the matter on multiple occasions wherein notice of motion is yet to be issued after filing of the case in October, 2024.

Yet in the larger interest of justice, the application is allowed and the main case is preponed and taken on Board for hearing today itself.

Main case

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari seeking quashing order dated-01.09.2016 and 18.01.2017 (Annexure P-2 Annexure P-3) being illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and more so discriminatory come of the officials facing same charges have been completely exonerated and charge-sheet have been dropped but the present petitioner have been imposed punishment "recorded warning" and further once the suspension period have been treated leave of the kind due allowance for of to then restricting pay and suspension period suspension allowance only is again face of it unconstitutional illegal, and arbitrary even double jeopardy & further seeking quashing of order dated 28.10.2020 & 08.07.2023 (Annexure P-4 & Annexure P-5) vide which appeal and mercy appeal filled by the petitioner have been rejected and thus same are likely to be quashed at this stage alone in the interest of justice.

At this stage when the case was called for hearing in the main case, learned counsel Mr. J.S.Rana, Advocate appearing for Mr. S.K.Malik, Advocate for petitioner, seeks another opportunity to assist the Court stating that arguing counsel is in personal difficulty.

In light of the above, this Court is of the view that learned counsel for the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the matter any further.

Hence, the writ petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

09.12.2025
anuradha

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