



206

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

CWP-14738-2017

Date of Decision: 16.02.2026

BHUPENDER SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL.

Present:- Mr. Sarvesh Malik, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, AAG, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to expunge adverse remarks recorded in his ACR for the period 01.04.2011 to 06.11.2011 and grant him benefit of Annual Career Progression ('ACP') Scheme.

2. The petitioner joined Haryana Police as Constable on 03.12.1988. he could not clear Lower School Course, thus, was never promoted on substantive rank of Head Constable. In view of applicable Rules, he was promoted as Head Constable, Assistant Sub Inspector, Sub Inspector and Inspector on honorary basis i.e. 'Exemptee'. He superannuated on 30.11.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that adverse remarks in petitioner's ACR for the period from April' 2011 to November' 2011 deserves to be expunged. There was no reason to record adverse remarks. He has been denied benefit of ACP on account of adverse remarks.



4. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel submits that Reporting Authority is the best assessing authority. It knows act and conduct of its subordinates. The adverse remarks were based upon oral and written inputs received by Competent Authority.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. Hon'ble Supreme Court time and again has enunciated that adverse remarks qua integrity recorded in ACR adversely affect future prospects of an employee. Writing of confidential reports is an administrative function. Officers reporting upon performance must show objectivity, impartiality and fair assessment, without any prejudices whatsoever and the highest sense of responsibility so as to inculcate devotion to duty, honesty and integrity. Officers get demoralized by negative ACR which reduces their efficacy and efficiency. Confidential reports are maintained by the government and other organizations to assess the employee's service record at the time of consideration of his case for grant of increments, promotions, retention in service etc. The Courts would normally refrain to interfere with the recording thereof. The reason for such reluctance is because the officer who is entrusted with the duty of writing confidential reports is best suited for this job.

7. In the case in hand, the respondent has pleaded that remarks were recorded on the basis of close supervision of work and conduct of the petitioner. He was apprised for the same on number of occasions with verbal warning to improve himself. His integrity was found doubtful and accordingly, adverse remarks were recorded.

8. The Reporting Authority has specifically pointed out that there were complaints against the petitioner. He was verbally instructed on numerous



occasions to improve his conduct. He initially accepted adverse remarks and filed representation after two years which was highly belated. It is supervising authority which knows weakness and strength of its employee. Judicial interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not warranted because there is no misuse of power or *mala fide* on the part of respondent. Further, there is no material irregularity in terms of jurisdiction or procedure.

9. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere with remarks recorded by Authority in the ACR of the petitioner. The petitioner may approach authorities for benefit of ACP, if otherwise permissible in law.

10. ***Disposed of.***

11. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

16.02.2026
SDK

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