



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

CWP-30123-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : **22.05.2025**

JILE SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Tarun, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana
for respondents no.1 to 9.

None for respondent no.12.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

CM-7678-CWP-2025

1. Application is **allowed**, subject to all just exceptions, and record of General Body Meeting held on 04.01.2025, and RTI application alongwith response dated 23.01.2025 (Annexure A-1 and Annexure A-2 respectively), are ordered to be taken on record.

CWP-30123-2024

2. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, challenge is thrown to the letter dated 16.10.2024 (Annexure P-9), issued by respondent no.4, appointing an *ad hoc* committee vide which respondents no.10 to 12, have been appointed as members of the said committee.

3. The only ground for throwing challenge to the appointment of *ad hoc* committee (*supra*), is that there are some allegations of embezzlement against the members thereof.

4. This Court has put a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner, as to what are the legal grounds which disqualify respondents no.10 to 12, to be part of the *adhoc* committee, specifically, when the charges against them, have yet not been proved, he, furthermore, while referring to the supervening events, wherethrough, the elections have been held by the *adhoc* committee, and even the said elections were alleged to have been annulled by the General Body, submits that the act and conduct of the General Body, post appointment is not in accordance with law/bye-laws.

5. Considering the aforesaid submissions, this Court does not find any merit in the same, as how come, the event post the appointment of *adhoc* committee, would be the reasons to throw challenge to the order of appointment *adhoc* committee.

6. Further, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to cite any provision of law to substantiate his argument, or any error in the order (*supra*), which is sought to quashed. Therefore, there is no merit in the instant petition, which is, consequently **dismissed**.

7. However, in case the petitioner, still has any grievance with regard to the supervening events, as referred to, in the aforesaid application, he is at liberty to take all the alternate remedies, as are available to him, as per law.

May 22, 2025

dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No