

**CWP-25014-2024****-1-****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH****257****CWP-25014-2024****Date of Decision: 20.01.2026****Nazir Khan****...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. G.S. Gopera, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Teevar Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J.** (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 09.11.2023 whereby Director General of Police, Haryana (for short 'DGP') has rejected his revision seeking reinstatement on the ground of acquittal in criminal cases.

2. The petitioner joined Haryana Police Force as Constable on 06.04.2012. He came to be implicated in FIR No.561 dated 21.05.2015 under Sections 201, 216, 379, 413, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Chandnibagh, Panipat for alleged offence of theft of a car. He was dismissed from service on 02.03.2016 on account of his implication in aforesaid FIR. He unsuccessfully preferred appeal as well as revision before the Authorities. He along with other co-accused faced trial and came to be acquitted by the Trial Court vide judgment dated 20.02.2023. He requested DGP to reinstate



CWP-25014-2024

-2-

him in service in the light of his acquittal in aforesaid criminal case who rejected his request/revision.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per Rule 16.3 of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as applicable to State of Haryana) (for short ‘PPR’), the case of petitioner needs to be reconsidered.

4. On being confronted with judgment dated 02.04.2025 passed by this Court in **CWP No.18777 of 2023, Bala Singh v. State of Haryana and Others**; judgment dated 21.05.2025 passed in **CWP No.21304 of 2024 Nirmaljit Singh v. State of Punjab and Others**; and judgment dated 27.05.2025 passed in **CWP No.25411 of 2022, Dheeraj Kumar v. State of Haryana and Others**, Mr. Teevar Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana expressed his inability to controvert the fact that as per Rule 16.3 of PPR, matter needs to be reconsidered by the competent Authority.

5. In the light of orders passed in **Bala Singh (Supra)**, **Nirmaljit Singh (Supra)** and **Dheeraj Kumar (Supra)** as well as Rule 16.3 of PPR, the impugned orders are hereby set aside and DGP, Haryana is directed to pass fresh order in terms of Rule 16.3 of PPR.

6. Disposed of in above terms.

7. It is made clear that nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)  
JUDGE

20.01.2026  
Mohit Kumar

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |