



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

122

CWP-6900-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.03.2026

Mona Rani

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab Gramin Bank and others

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate
with Ms. Preeti Grover, Advocate
Mr. Anshu Pareek, Advocate
and Mr. Mukul Chauhan, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing of the Order dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.4 whereby a re-institution of enquiry was ordered and for quashing of the charge-sheet dated 06.05.2024 (Annexure P-2) alongwith all consequential proceedings initiated in pursuance of the charge-sheet. Further prayer has been made to restrain the respondents to proceed further in pursuance of the order dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-4), during the pendency of the writ petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was appointed as Cashier on 16.04.2008. She was



thereafter promoted as Junior Scale Manager on 04.11.2016. She was posted as Branch Officer at Makrod Sahib on 14.06.2021 and she handed over the charge on 05.05.2023. He further submits that the petitioner was placed under suspension on 19.05.2023 (Annexure P-1). Thereafter, a charge-sheet dated 06.05.2024 (Annexure P-2) was issued to her alleging certain irregularities in pension accounts and loan sanctions. A departmental enquiry was conducted and the Enquiry Officer submitted a report dated 05.05.2025 (Annexure P-3) holding the charges proved against the petitioner. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted the detailed objections dated 09.09.2025 stating that the documents relied upon were not supplied to her; she was also not given an opportunity to examine the defence witnesses; the findings recorded in the enquiry report are beyond the charges mentioned in the charge-sheet and the burden of proof was wrongly shifted upon the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that instead of considering and deciding the said objections in accordance with law, the Disciplinary Authority passed the impugned order dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) directing re-institution of the departmental enquiry on the ground that the earlier enquiry suffered from serious irregularities. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the said order is wholly without jurisdiction as Regulation 41 of the Punjab Gramin Bank (Officers and Employees) Service Regulations, 2010 does not confer any power upon the Disciplinary Authority to order a *de novo* enquiry. A second enquiry cannot be ordered merely to fill up the



lacuna in the case of the department or to enable the employer to improve its case. Mere dissatisfaction with the earlier proceedings cannot justify a fresh enquiry. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that a fresh enquiry cannot be ordered merely to correct defects or fill gaps in the evidence of the earlier proceedings as the same is impermissible in law.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents, appearing on advance notice, at the outset, submits that the petitioner is arguing against her own cause. The competent authority, while passing the impugned order, has specifically observed that the petitioner has not been granted adequate opportunities to defend her case efficiently and as such, the impugned order was, in fact, passed in favour of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that the competent authority would pass a fresh order, satisfying the objective standard of reasons and justice on the basis of the enquiry report, within a period of eight weeks from today.

4. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of. The order dated 13.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) is hereby set-aside. The respondent/competent authority is directed to pass a fresh order in accordance with the law and the observations made hereinabove, after duly considering the enquiry report.

5. The respondent/competent authority shall pass a fresh order after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. The

2026:PHHC:035169



order so passed shall fully reflect the detailed reasoning based on the findings of the enquiry report.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

09.03.2026
yakub

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