



108

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

**CWP-7216-2026 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 11.03.2026**

**Sunita Sahni**

**... Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana and others**

**... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

Present: Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* seeking quashing of the memorandum/chargesheet dated 16.10.2023 (Annexure P-9), enquiry report dated 23.05.2024 (Annexure P-10), office order dated 06.01.2026 (Annexure P-11) passed by respondent No.2, vide which two annual increments have been stopped, memorandum/chargesheet dated 02.09.2024 (Annexure P-13), enquiry report dated 29.01.2025 (Annexure P-14) and office order dated 16.01.2026 (Annexure P-15), whereby the petitioner has been compulsorily retired from service. It is further prayed to direct the respondents to reinstate the petitioner and permit him to join her



duties at headquarter and also to release the salary withheld by the respondents.

2. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner confines his prayer to the extent that the respondents be directed to decide the statutory appeal of the petitioner on merits in a time bound manner, in terms of a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Prem Nath Bali Vs. Registrar, High Court of Delhi and another, Civil Appeal No.958 of 2010***, decided on 16.12.2015 and the judgment of this Court in ***CWP-9606-2022*** titled as ***Khairati Lal Vs. State of Haryana and others***, decided on 13.10.2025, wherein it has been held that the disciplinary proceedings against an employee must be decided within a reasonable time, by passing the speaking order, as she apprehends that statutory appeal would not be decided in a timely manner to defeat her right.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. AG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State while Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3 and he submits that the petitioner straightway approached this Court without filing the statutory appeal under Rule 9 of Haryana Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 2016 and Rule 10 of the said Rules provides limitation period of 45 days to challenge the punishment order, followed by another 45 days, if sufficient cause is shown. He further submits that in case the petitioner prefers a statutory appeal, same would be decided on merits in terms of the aforesaid



judgment, in a timely manner, by passing a speaking order.

5. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, present petition is disposed of and respondent-appellate authority is directed to decide the statutory appeal on merits, to be filed by the petitioner, strictly in terms of the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Prem Nath Bali***'s case (*supra*) and by this Court in ***Khairati Lal***'s case (*supra*) and pass a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to her, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. An appropriate and speaking order be passed, only if the petitioner prefers a statutory appeal within a period of two weeks from today.

7. It is clarified that while deciding the statutory appeal of the petitioner, the appellate authority would not raise hyper-technical objection with regard to limitation.

8. Further, the decision taken by the respondent-appellate authority shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

9. The pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

[ HARPREET SINGH BRAR ]  
JUDGE

11.03.2026  
*vishnu*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No