

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

114

CWP-35527-2025

Date of Decision: 23.12.2025

MANISHA BAI

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Ms. Anu Chatrath, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ratik Kapur, 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 order dated 30.10.2025, Annexure P-9, whereby the petitioner's service as Computer Operator Programming Assistant Instructor (COPA) has been terminated by passing a stigmatic order.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner joined as Instructor on contract basis in the Department with effect from 24.01.2017. Her services have been terminated by levelling serious allegations about her conduct with a student, though charges in that regard have not been established in any inquiry. She further contended that the allegations are false and the petitioner has lodged an FIR regarding the incident also, wherein, by way of disclosure statement, the accused/student admitted his guilt about the making of petitioner's false video which was made the basis of her termination. The police have now filed a chargesheet against the student dated 05.07.2025, and the matter is pending trial.

3. Learned State counsel has received instructions from the second respondent/Director General, Skill Development and Industrial Training



Department, vide memo dated 22.12.2025, which is retained on the case file as Annexure ‘A’. Referring to the same, she contends that on receiving a complaint regarding circulation of objectionable video on social media, the petitioner was issued a show cause notice dated 09.06.2025, Annexure P-6, and after considering her reply, Annexure P-7, the impugned order has been passed. She, however, does not dispute that no inquiry into the matter was ordered.

4. Considering the submissions and the facts on record, it has become apparent that the impugned termination order is stigmatic on the face of it and has been passed without the disputed facts regarding alleged misconduct of the petitioner having been established before the competent authority by way of a fair enquiry. Besides, the order is cryptic in nature and lacks reasoning. This renders it illegal being violative of the Principles of Natural Justice.

5. Accordingly, the termination order, dated 30.10.2025, is set aside granting liberty to the respondents to pass a fresh order in accordance with law after holding an inquiry into the allegations of alleged misconduct against the petitioner. In the meanwhile, she will be allowed to work on the terms she was working prior to passing of the termination order.

6. The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

23.12.2025
Ad

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>