



CWP-35170-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

294

CWP-35170-2024

Date of Decision: 17.03.2025

Sukhbir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Mohnish Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. On 09.01.2025, this Court passed the following order: -

“On being pointed out, Mr. Mohnish Sharma, Advocate expressed his inability to controvert the fact that impugned orders Annexures P-2 and P-3 were passed on 14.03.2018 and there is no explanation for inordinate delay in assailing those orders.

At this stage, he submits that his case may be considered qua order dated 03.06.2022 and charge-sheet dated 01.04.2020. He submits that petitioner retired in 2015 whereas respondents after more than two years of retirement started issuing charge-sheets. The charge-sheet dated 01.04.2020 and order dated 03.06.2022 are bad in the eye of law.

Notice of motion, returnable for 03.02.2025.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents and waives service. She seeks time to file reply.

To be taken up immediately after Urgent List.”



2. Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, during the course of hearing, produced office order dated 13.03.2025 passed by XEN (OP)-Division, UHBVN, Samalkha. The same is taken on record as Annexure ‘A’.

3. Learned State counsel submits that proceedings arising out of charge sheet dated 01.04.2020 (Annexure P-11) stands dropped and case of the petitioner *qua* pension and gratuity is under process. The benefits to which petitioner is entitled would be released within four weeks from today. The petitioner may be directed to supply documents as required by the competent authority.

4. In the wake of statement of learned State counsel, the present petition stands disposed of.

5. It is made clear that respondent would not ask for unnecessary or irrelevant documents or the documents which are already in its custody.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

17.03.2025
Mohit Kumar

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