



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

116

CWP-11620-2025

Date of Decision: 17.03.2026

ANUBHAV KHANNA

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Anubhav Khanna, petitioner-in person
(*through V.C.*)

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

Mr. Hunar Veer Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.3-Municipal Corporation

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking removal of respondent No.6 from the post of Accountant in Abohar Municipal Corporation by issuing writ of *quo warranto*.

2. On 17.09.2025, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Tagged files have been perused.

Petitioner had approached this Court by filing two different writ petitions. The first writ petition (CWP-5579-2025) was filed for issuance of a writ in the nature of quo warranto for removal of respondent No.3, from the membership of the Apex Council of Punjab Cricket Association. As

the petitioner had concealed his relationship with respondent No.3, who was the brother of petitioner's estranged spouse, writ was dismissed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 28.02.2025, and cost of Rs.50,000/- was imposed upon the petitioner.

The second writ petition (CWP-PIL-154-2025) was filed alleging wrong use of basement in the urban areas of District Fazilka, in violation of the Punjab Urban Planning and Development Building Rules, 2018, and other Municipal Laws. During the course of hearing of this writ, it transpired that the petitioner had an axe to grind, as he had dispute with his wife, who was the niece of the owner of a gym situated in the basement in Fazilka City. This writ petition was dismissed by the 1st Division Bench by imposing cost of Rs.25,000/-.

List on 11.12.2025.

Let the petitioner file a specific affidavit explaining his locus standi to maintain the present petition as also his relationship, if any, with the private respondents."

3. The petitioner claims respondent No.6 was convicted under Sections 420 and 177 of IPC by Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Abohar. An inquiry alleging commission of offence of cheating and forging is pending against respondent No.6. He has obtained Master's degree in Commerce (M.Com) through distance education from Mahatma Gandhi University, Meghalaya. As per University Grants Commission Norms, the University was not authorized to any off-campus centers. All

the examinations were required to be conducted in Campus at Meghalaya. The respondent No.6 never visited University Campus, Meghalaya. The respondents No.7 to 9 have been wrongly shown in the seniority list. The petitioner in his affidavits has disclosed that respondent No.6 is his wife's uncle.

4. It appears that petitioner is filing multiple complaints against relatives of his estranged wife. He has been subjected to costs on two occasions by this Court. The present petition has been primarily filed against respondent No.6 who is uncle of his wife. It appears that he has entangled respondents No.7 to 9 just to justify his petition against respondent No.6. He has no right to dispute seniority among employees of Municipal Corporation because he is neither employee of Municipal Corporation nor directly/indirectly affected by said seniority. There are allegations against respondent No.6 to the effect that he has been selected/retained in service despite conviction by trial Court.

5. Learned State counsel as well as counsel for Municipal Corporation submits that competent authority would look into the matter with respect to status of respondent No.6.

6. In the wake of statement of counsel for respondents the petition stands disposed of. It is made clear that authorities would examine the matter without being influenced by allegations of petitioner. This Court has not expressed any opinion on merits.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 17, 2026
Deepak DPA

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