



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

- 1)

CWP-8932-2020
Date of decision: 11.02.2026
- Ankur Garg

Versus

....Petitioner
- Punjab State Warehousing Corporation and another

...Respondents
- 2)

CWP-28921-2024
- Ranjit Singh Uppal

Versus

....Petitioner
- Punjab State Warehousing Corporation and another

...Respondents
- 3)

CWP-1505-2024
- Baljeet Singh

Versus

....Petitioner
- Punjab State Warehousing Corporation and another

...Respondents
- 4)

CWP-20734-2024
- Balwinder Kumar

Versus

....Petitioner
- Punjab State Warehousing Corporation and another

...Respondents
- 5)

CWP-13822-2020
- Rajvir Singh

Versus

....Petitioner
- Punjab State Warehousing Corporation

...Respondent



6)

CWP-8975-2020

Bodh Raj

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Warehousing Corporation and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sukhandeep Singh, Advocate and
Mr. J.P. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in all cases.

Mr. Vikas Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Athar Ahmed, Advocate
for the respondent(s) (in CWP-28921-2024).

Mr. M.S. Batth, Advocate
for the respondent(s) (in CWP-13822-2020).

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Advocate
for the respondent(s) (in CWP-8932-2020 &
CWP-8975-2020).

Mr. Parambir Singh, Advocate,
Ms. Neha Randhawa, Advocate and
Ms. Prabhpreet Kaur, Advocate
for respondent No.1 (in CWP-1505-2024).

Ms. Bisman Mann, Advocate
for the respondent(s) (in CWP-20734-2024).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This common order shall dispose of the aforementioned civil writ petitions as they arise from a similar factual matrix. However, for the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from CWP-8932-2020.

2. The present civil writ petition(s) has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the order dated 16.03.2020 (Annexure P-6) issued vide



endorsement dated 07.05.2020, whereby, the statutory appeal dated 25.10.2019 (Annexure P-4) filed by the petitioner has been rejected against the order of punishment dated 22.08.2019 (Annexure P-3) issued under endorsement No. PWC/Admin/E-4/EF-807/19304-14/19 dated 19.09.2019. Further, for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing of order of punishment dated 22.08.2019 (Annexure P-3) passed by respondent No.1 and for quashing show cause notice dated 18.02.2019 (Annexure P-1).

3. On 20.07.2020, the following order was passed:-

“All cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

By these petitions, the petitioners seek issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari, quashing the orders dated 16.03.2020 (issued vide an endorsement dated 07.05.2020), as also the orders dated 25.10.2019, whereby statutory appeals have been rejected, filed against the orders of punishment dated 22.08.2019, issued under endorsement no. PWC/Admin/E-4/EF-807/19304-14/19 dated 19.09.2020.

Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia submits that the impugned orders (in both these appeals), dated 22.08.2019, has been based upon a report which was asked for by the Managing Director on 05.09.2019.

He therefore submits that without the petitioners having been given any opportunity to rebut or refute the said report, the order has actually been passed behind their backs, though it is shown to have been passed after giving them a personal hearing (which they are not denying), but for the fact that they had no chance to refute the said report at all.

He further points out that in fact in paragraph 8 of the order



dated 22.08.2019, a letter dated 05.09.2019, bearing number 3771, has been referred to.

Notice of motion.

Mr. M.S. Dullat, Advocate, appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents, he already having received instructions in that regard.

Copies of the petitions be e-mailed to Mr. Dullat today itself, by learned counsel for the petitioners.

Adjourned to 24.07.2020.

The Managing Director of the Corporation, is directed to file his personal affidavit in reply to the petitions, specifically also answering therein the query of this court as to how a letter dated 05.09.2019 has been referred to in the impugned order dated 22.08.2019.

Prime facie (in fact almost ex facie), it would seem that the order has been passed with absolutely no application of mind, if the contents of paragraph 8 of the petitions are perused, because a letter written after the date of the order, has been relied upon in the order.

In the aforesaid circumstances, operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the other connected case.”

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation is not averse to passing a fresh order after supplying the report on which the reliance has been placed by the Managing Director before passing the impugned order. Admittedly, the Managing Director of the respondent-Corporation has passed the impugned order based upon the report which was admittedly not supplied to the petitioners in all the cases to enable them to rebut or file any response in



CWP-8932-2020 and other connected cases

-5-

their defence. As such, the impugned action is passed without following the principles of natural justice.

5. He further submits that the fresh order would be passed after supplying the report dated 05.09.2019 to the petitioners after affording them personal hearing and any written arguments made by the petitioners shall be considered by the competent authority while passing a fresh order.

6. In view of the same, all the six writ petitions are disposed of accordingly.

7. A photo copy of this order be placed on the file of connected cases.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

11.02.2026

Neha

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