



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

214

CWP-23830-2017(O&M)

Date of Decision : **February 03, 2026**

MANJINDER SINGH DHILLON

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

SHIROMANI GURDWARA PARBANDHAK COMMITTEE AND ANR.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA

Present : Mr.Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vishal Munjal, Advocate for the respondents.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

1. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3) whereby, the petitioner has been held incapable to hold the post of Principal.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was appointed as a Principal in Sahibzada Ajit Singh Khalsa Public School, Bazidpur, District Ferozepur, by respondent No.1, vide appointment letter dated 31.01.2015 (Annexure P-1). The petitioner was initially appointed on a contract for a period of one year which could be further extended for another year. As per the terms and conditions of the appointment letter dated 31.01.2015 (Annexure P-1), during the period of contract, the petitioner could be relieved from the job with an advance notice of one month or by paying one month's salary. However, in the case where the work and conduct is not found satisfactory during the period of contract, the services of the petitioner could be terminated without any notice. One driver Mr. Malkiat Singh filed a complaint against the petitioner and the same was referred to Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee after taking into consideration the work and

conduct of the petitioner vide order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3) held that the petitioner was incapable of holding the post of Principal. Aggrieved against the abovesaid order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3), the petitioner submitted various representations and also served a legal notice dated 01.02.2017 (Annexure P-5). However, the respondents did not take any action on the representations and legal notice served by the petitioner, as a consequence of this, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3).

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3) is liable to be quashed on the ground that no copy of the complaint was ever supplied to the petitioner nor any enquiry was held before passing of the abovesaid order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3), which amounts to punishment.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the petitioner was duly associated in the enquiry held by the Sub-Committee. The contentions raised by the petitioner were duly considered by the Sub-Committee. The petitioner admitted before the Sub-Committee that he was engaged in an inappropriate relationship. Taking into consideration that the petitioner had admitted having an inappropriate relationship, there was no requirement for holding any enquiry, as such, the impugned order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3) is legal and valid.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties at some length, the issue involved in the present writ petition is whether enquiry was required to be held before passing of the order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3). A

perusal of the facts of the present case would show that a complaint was filed against the petitioner and a Sub-Committee was constituted to enquire into the matter. The petitioner was duly associated in the enquiry and taking into consideration the conduct of the petitioner and admission on the part of the petitioner in regard to an inappropriate relationship, the order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3) was passed by the respondents wherein, it was held that the petitioner was incapable of holding the post of Principal. It is well settled law that in a case of admission by an employee, in regard to his conduct there is no requirement of holding any enquiry. It is not in dispute that the petitioner has admitted his conduct in regard to an inappropriate relationship as such, as per the law, there is no requirement of holding any enquiry before passing of order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3). Taking into consideration the conduct of the petitioner that while working on the post of Principal, as the petitioner was held to be engaged in an inappropriate relationship which was duly admitted by the petitioner and as per the terms and conditions of the appointment letter, the services of the petitioner were rightly terminated.

6. In view of the facts of the present case, this Court finds no infirmity in the impugned order dated 08.08.2016 (Annexure P-3). Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

February 03, 2026
ajaysharma

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No