



CWP-6451-2026

-1-

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

125

CWP-6451-2026

Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

Dhan Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Babbar Bhan, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 12.12.2025 (Annexure P-1) whereby respondent No.4 has been awarded punishment of compulsory retirement instead of dismissal from service. She is further seeking direction to respondents not to release retiral and pensionary dues of respondent No.4.

2. The petitioner claims herself to be a public-spirited person and this is her third round of litigation. She has filed complaints against respondent No.4-Anita Dahiya alleging that Anita had fraudulently obtained employment against ESM quota. She approached this Court by way of *CWP No.17717 of 2022* which was disposed of vide order dated 13.11.2024 with a direction to respondents to decide her representation dated 26.05.2022. A regular departmental inquiry was initiated against respondent No.4. Petitioner again approached this Court by way of

COCP No.5896 of 2025 against inaction of the respondents to conclude the



CWP-6451-2026

-2-

departmental proceedings which was disposed of vide order dated 02.12.2025 in view of final date of hearing in the disciplinary proceedings. The Inquiry Officer vide order dated 02.08.2024 found respondent No.4 guilty of the alleged charges pursuant to which punishing authority vide letter dated 26.09.2025 recommended dismissal from service. The proposal of dismissal from service vide order dated 08.12.2025 was substituted with compulsory retirement. Accordingly, respondent No.4 was compulsorily retired on 12.12.2025.

3. The petitioner is claiming that she is public-spirited lady and order dated 12.12.2025 passed by Disciplinary Authority whereby respondent No.4 has been compulsorily retired should be substituted by order of dismissal from service. It is purely a service matter and Authorities have examined the issue. The Disciplinary Authority, as per its wisdom, has awarded punishment of compulsory retirement. As per applicable Service Rules, the higher authorities may review or consider for any other remedy, if find that punishment is not proportionate to alleged offence. The petitioner could file complaint which she did and Authorities initiated proceedings against respondent No.4. The petitioner has now no *locus standi qua* quantum of punishment.

4. In the backdrop, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

06.04.2026
Mohit Kumar

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