



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

215-2

RSA-3150-2005 (O&M)

Date of decision: 04.02.2026

State of Haryana

.....Appellant

Versus

Chiranji Lal

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, AAG, Haryana
for the appellant.

Mr. Mohit Nehra, Advocate and
Mr. Vijay Dahiya, Advocate for the respondent.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant Regular Second Appeal has been preferred by the appellant/plaintiff-State of Haryana impugning the judgments and decrees passed by the learned Trial Court and the First Appellate Court dated 27.03.2003 and 10.05.2005, respectively, whereby the suit filed by the State has been dismissed. Parties to the *lis* hereinafter shall be referred to by their original position before the learned Trial Court.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the State of Haryana preferred a suit for recovery of Rs.1,10,406.37 paisa against defendant-Chiranji Lal (Ex-Junior Engineer of PWD B&R, Branch Charkhi Dadri), *inter alia*, on the allegation that while the defendant was posted as Sanctional Officer in Provincial Division, PWD B&R from December, 1977 to July, 1979, he had committed misappropriation of Government material and prepared fictitious Muster Rolls amounting to Rs.98,348.46 paisa as per the following details:-

“i) Prepared false Muster Roll No.1196P, 1201-P,
1202-P, 1205-P, 1231-P, 1235-P, 1484-P and 1486-

P (Punishment order vide Engineer-in-Chief, Haryana P.W.D. (B&R) Branch Chandigarh no.19 dated 1.2.89. Rs.25788.25P

- ii) Engineer-in-Chief, Haryana officer order No.20 dated 1.2.1989 mis-appropriated Govt. material and Rs.48030.34P marked fictitious attendance in Muster Rolls and defraud the Govt. and caused loss to the state ex-chequer.*
- iii) Engineer-in-Chief, Chandigarh O/o No.23 dt. 1.2.89 made Rs.24529.87P fictitious booking through indents payment vouchers showing false direct consumption of material.*

Rs.98348.46P”

3. It is also a matter of fact that the defendant was issued three separate chargesheets and after holding enquiry, three separate orders of removal from service were passed by the plaintiff by way of punishment and also imposed recovery of the above said three amounts, vide order No.19 dated 01.02.1989 for Rs.25,788.25 paisa, order No.20 dated 01.02.1989 for Rs.48,030.34 paisa and order No.23 dated 01.02.1989 for Rs.24,529.87 paisa. It is also not in dispute that the said orders of punishment of removal coupled with the recovery have been challenged by the defendant by filing three separate Civil Suits before the learned Civil Courts at Bhiwani.

4. Since the recovery order for the three amounts mentioned hereinabove, is part of the punishment orders, therefore, nothing survives to be adjudicated in the present appeal, which stands disposed of accordingly.

5. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

04.02.2026

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

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