



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

109

CWP-33490-2025

Date of Decision: 17.11.2025

INDERJIT SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF UT, CHANDIGARH AND ORS

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate &
Mr. Varun Sandhu, Advocate for respondent-U.T.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 19.08.2025 whereby he has been held responsible for delay of 37 days in providing information under Punjab Right to Service (Amendment) Act, 2014 as extended to Union Territory, Chandigarh.

2. The petitioner joined Public Health Wing of the Engineering Department on 04.08.2009. He was transferred as SDO (Building), Estate Office, U.T. Chandigarh. He was transferred to Sanitary Installation SubDivision No.2, Chandigarh on 19.05.2025. He was transferred to Public Health Division No.7, Sector 7, Chandigarh on 09.09.2025. He was held responsible for delay of 109 days in supplying requisite information to the concerned branch of Estate Office, U.T., Chandigarh

which led to delay in providing information to respondent No.4. The respondent initiated proceedings against the petitioner under Section 17(1)(b) of Punjab Right to Service Act, 2011. He appeared before respondent and submitted written submissions. He clarified that there was no delay on his part. He had processed application on time. The respondent despite explanation advanced by petitioner has imposed penalty of Rs.3,000/-.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that impugned order may affect his future prospects.
4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that as per her instructions, the impugned order dated 19.08.2025 will have no effect in any way on the service record either for ACR or promotion of the petitioner. No Departmental proceeding has been initiated against him pursuant to aforesaid lapse.
5. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the present petition.
6. Dismissed as not pressed.
7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

17.11.2025
mahima

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No