



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

132

CWP-13158-2026

Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

SANDEEP SARDANA

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Sardana, petitioner-in person

Mr. Akshit Pathania, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of inquiry report dated 05.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) conducted by ADC, Sirsa whereby his complaint dated 08.10.2025 has been dismissed/closed. He is also seeking setting aside of inquiry report dated 19.05.2023 (Annexure P-2) conducted by respondent No.6 on the complaint dated 28.03.2022. He is further seeking direction to respondents No.1&2 to conduct fresh inquiry into the fabrication of record committed by respondents No.3 to 7.

2. As per pleadings, the petitioner is a public-spirited person. He is a former District President of Congress. He filed complaint dated 28.03.2022 before CM Window seeking implementation of order dated 12.05.2021 whereby Director Secondary Education had directed District Education Officers/Block Education Officers throughout the state of Haryana to ensure reading of NCERT/SCERT books in all private as well as government undertaking schools/institutions. Respondent No.6 instead

of forwarding the complaint to higher authorities himself vide report dated 19.05.2023 concluded the inquiry. The petitioner filed complaint dated 08.10.2025 before respondent No.3 assailing inquiry report dated 19.05.2023. Respondent No.4-Additional Deputy Commissioner, Sirsa vide report dated 05.02.2026 on the basis of reports and documents prepared by respondent No.6 closed his complaint. As per Government instructions dated 10.06.2015, inquiry cannot be conducted by an officer against whom complaint is filed. In the present case, respondent No.6 conducted inquiry into complaint lodged against him.

3. On being asked, petitioner who is present in person submits that while preparing impugned report, the respondents have made adverse remarks against him. He has been attempted to be implicated. It has caused prejudice to him.

4. The respondent on the application of petitioner has examined the matter. They have not found any infirmity in compliance of Government instructions. From the perusal of record, it is evident that authorities have spent a lot of time while inquiring petitioner's claim. If he feels that there are adverse observations against him, he may approach appropriate forum. This Court cannot invoke its jurisdiction only on the ground that authorities have made adverse observations about him.

5. Dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

April 30, 2026
Deepak DPA

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