



CWP-28701-2025

-1-

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

Serial No.105

**CWP-28701-2025
Decided on:14.11.2025**

Rajinder Kumar Arora

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J.(ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the chargesheet dated 25.04.2025, Annexure P-5, on the ground that the charges are the same regarding which the petitioner had earlier been issued a chargesheet dated 16.11.2023, Annexure P-12, which was dropped by the State vide order dated 27.09.2024, Annexure P-2.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the aforementioned chargesheet was issued to the petitioner on a complaint, dated 08.02.2023, filed by teachers/staff of the Government College. The allegations pertain to the period when he worked as Principal in Charge / Drawing and Disbursing Officer (DDO) in the College from 09.01.2020 to 10.10.2023. The

**CWP-28701-2025****-2-**

impugned chargesheet has also been issued on the same charges, which amounts to double jeopardy to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel, however, contends that the charges in the impugned chargesheet are different and based upon fresh allegations levelled against the petitioner on a complaint made by Dr. Ram Niwas Yadav, Principal, Government College for Girls, Cheeka, Kaithal. In his complaint dated 08.04.2024, Annexure P-4, he has only attached a copy of the earlier complaint against the petitioner dated 08.02.2023, Annexure P-4, which would not make any difference as the impugned chargesheet against the petitioner, dated 25.04.2025, is on subsequent misconduct. These facts are apparent as per details in the instructions, Annexure 'A'. She further contends that enquiry against the petitioner has been concluded after hearing the concerned parties, and its report is awaited.

4. Heard.

5. The perusal of the instructions makes it apparent that the charges levelled against the petitioner in the impugned chargesheet, dated 25.04.2025, are different from the ones for which he was chargesheeted earlier on 16.11.2023. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to dispute the facts mentioned therein. Accordingly, dropping of the earlier chargesheet will have no bearing so far as the later chargesheet is concerned, and it cannot be said to be a case of double jeopardy.

6. Dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

14.11.2025*Mehak*

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