



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

111

CWP-6924-2026

Date of Decision: 09.03.2026

AMIR SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Majra, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to keep departmental proceedings in abeyance till the conclusion of criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No.19 dated 17.01.2025, under Sections 103(1), 238(A), 111(2), 111(3), 111(4), 111(6), 61(2) of BNS registered at Police Station Kalayat, District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that case of petitioner is squarely covered by judgment of Supreme Court in ***Capt. M. Paul Anthony vs. Bharat Gold Mines Ltd., 1999(3) SCC 679***. The foundation of trial as well as departmental proceedings is same, thus, unless and until he is found guilty by trial Court, he should not be departmentally punished. The Department may not be permitted to examine common witnesses.

3. Mr. Akshit Pathania, AAG, Haryana submits that a Coordinate Bench of this Court after noticing judgment of Supreme Court

in *Capt. M. Paul Anthony's case (supra)* has dismissed a bunch of petitions including *CWP No.15845 of 2023*. The aggrieved officials preferred intra court appeals including *LPA No.1255 of 2024 and 1146 of 2024*. The intra court appeals stand dismissed vide judgment dated 22.05.2024 and 08.05.2024.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.
5. It is undisputed fact that a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court has dismissed a bunch of petitions involving identical facts and issues. The judgment passed by a Co-ordinate Bench stands upheld by a Division Bench of this Court.
6. In the wake of judgment dated 22.05.2024 passed by Division Bench of this Court in **LPA No.1255 of 2024** titled as “*Tulsi Dass vs. State of Haryana and others*” and judgment dated 08.05.2024 passed in **LPA No.1146 of 2024** titled as “*ASI Pawan Kumar vs. State of Haryana and others*”, it can be concluded that the respondent cannot travel beyond the police report, thus, no prejudice is going to be caused to petitioner, if he leads his defence in departmental proceedings. There is no substance in the apprehension expressed by the petitioner.
7. Dismissed.
8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 09, 2026
Deepak DPA

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