



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

220

CWP-15737-2014

Date of Decision: 30.01.2026

JAIPAL

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Ravi Partap Singh, DAG Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting side of orders passed by departmental authorities whereby he was awarded punishment of stoppage of six annual increments with permanent effect.

2. The petitioner joined Haryana Police on 30.11.1987. In December' 2011, he was posted in CIA Staff, Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar. An FIR No.457 dated 20.12.2011 under Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station City Bahadurgarh was registered. He was investigating the matter. He arrested accused Dharambir @ Tempa and produced him before the trial Court on 21.12.2011. One person namely Sonu S/o Ramesh Kumar submitted a complaint before higher authorities along with CD that petitioner has demanded a sum of Rs.35,000/- in lieu of releasing his Innova car. It was also alleged by him that Constable Pardeep Kumar has demanded a sum of Rs.50,000/-. The respondent conducted inquiry and found him guilty on the basis of CD. It is apt to mention here that Sonu-complainant appeared before Inquiry Officer as

PW6. He deposed that he has made allegation of demand of Rs.35,000/-

against petitioner with intent to save himself from arrest and recovery of his arms. The Inquiry Officer found him guilty of alleged misconduct and Disciplinary Authority vide order dated 30.01.2013 awarded him punishment of stoppage of six annual increments with permanent effect. He preferred appeal which came to be rejected vide order dated 29.05.2014 passed by the Appellate Authority. He was also subjected to departmental inquiry alleging that he did not take into custody Innova car at the time of arrest of accused. He was awarded punishment of stoppage of two increments. The said punishment was finally set aside.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was wrongly implicated. He had not committed alleged offence. The Inquiry Officer did not appreciate evidence in true spirit and held him guilty. The higher authorities have passed impugned orders without application of mind. The appellate order deserves to be set aside on the ground that it is non-speaking

4. Learned State counsel produced in Court audio recording which was played on computer of the Court Master. It was heard by everyone including petitioner who is present in Court.

5. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw.

6. Dismissed as withdrawn.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

January 30, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No