



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

1) CWP-14534-2026
Date of decision: 27.05.2026

Mohan ShyamPetitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

2) CWP-14535-2026

Deepak Kumar DwivediPetitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

3) CWP-14561-2026

Banwari Lal and othersPetitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. S.K. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondent No.2 (in CWP-14535-2026).

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2 (in CWP-14534-2026 &
CWP-14561-2026).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. With the consent of parties, this common order shall dispose of the
aforementioned civil writ petitions as they arise from a similar factual matrix.



CWP-14534-2026
CWP-14535-2026
CWP-14561-2026

-2-

However, for the sake of brevity, the facts are taken from CWP-14534-2026.

2. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing of the charge sheets dated 29.08.2019, 28.05.2020 & 25.08.2021 (Annexures P-1, P-2 & P-3, respectively), enquiry report dated 16.07.2021 (Annexure P-8) and recovery orders dated 08.03.2026 (Annexures P-13 & P-14) issued by respondent No.2. Further, for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to release all the retiral benefits and also to release an amount of Rs.17,12,271/- which has been withheld/deducted from the gratuity and leave encashment of the petitioner by respondent No.2.

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation submits that the petitioner(s) has an equally efficacious alternative remedy by way of a statutory appeal. The petitioner(s) instead of availing the said remedy, has directly approached this Court by filing the present writ petition(s).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that the petitioner(s) would file statutory appeal within a period of two weeks and a time bound direction be issued to the Appellate Authority to consider and decide the appeal filed by the petitioner(s) and till then, the impugned recovery imposed vide impugned orders may be kept in abeyance.

5. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) and the stand taken by learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation, without commenting further on the merits of the case, the above



CWP-14534-2026
CWP-14535-2026
CWP-14561-2026

-3-

mentioned all the petitions are disposed of with a direction to the Appellate Authority to consider the statutory appeal filed by the petitioner(s) without raising any hyper technical objection regarding limitation and decide the same on merits by passing a speaking order after affording them an opportunity of being heard within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. Till decision of the statutory appeal filed by the petitioner(s), the impugned recovery order shall be kept in abeyance.

7. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same be granted to them forthwith by Appellate Authority.

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

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.05.2026

Neha

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