



LPA-672-2025(O&M)

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

148

LPA-672-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision: August 18, 2025

H.R. Batra (Retd.)

.....Appellant (s)

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Rose Gupta, Advocate; Mr. Prateek Garg, Advocate and
Ms. Sheenam Bauchita, Advocate for the appellant(s).

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA J. (ORAL)

The appellant had challenged the order of punishment dated 23.12.1993, contained in Annexure P-17, awarding Censure entry. The order dated 23.12.1993 was challenged before the learned Single Judge on various grounds vide CWP-13816-1994, which has since been dismissed.

2. In para 6 of the judgment dated 26.09.2024, learned Single Judge has noticed the contentions advanced on behalf of the appellant and the reasons for its rejection. Para 6 of the judgment of the learned Single Judge, is reproduced as under:-

6. The first contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner alleging mala fide against the then College Principal is not sustainable since the concerned person has not been impleaded as a party to the petition. Secondly, it is apparent on record that vide the memorandum/show cause notice dated 26.02.1993, the punishing authority gave detailed reasons for disagreement with the conclusions



LPA-672-2025(O&M)

arrived at by the enquiry officer, and the final order of punishment, 23.12.1993, was passed only after considering the petitioner's response to the memorandum. The order of punishment recorded that the petitioner's reply, dated 31.03.1993, to the show cause notice was considered "and found unsatisfactory on the grounds as stipulated in the statement attached with the show cause notice served upon him vide Memo No.11/13/86-1 TE dated 09.03.1993". Therefore, there is no basis to contend that the reply was not considered before imposing the punishment. Lastly, only because an opportunity of personal hearing was not afforded to the petitioner before initiating the enquiry, it cannot be said that entire disciplinary proceedings got vitiated, especially when the petitioner had submitted a reply to the charge-sheet which was considered before appointing the enquiry officer and the former participated in the enquiry as well."

3. The reasons assigned by the learned Single Judge are self-explanatory and no perversity or illegality therein, has been shown. We are thus, in respectful agreement with the view taken by learned Single Judge.
4. Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.
5. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

August 18, 2025

sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No