

2026:PHHC:011579



CWP-29233-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

115

CWP-29233-2025

Date of Decision:28.01.2026

OM PARKASH

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, Advocate and  
Ms. Vanshika Daaria, Advocate  
for respondent No.6.

\*\*\*\*

**SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)**

1. Although, petitioner is neither an employee of the Department of Health nor connected with the health services in the State of Haryana, and his *locus standi* to file the present writ petition is doubtful. However, since he has filed this writ petition, *inter alia*, seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to act upon inquiry report dated 26.03.2024, Annexure P-8, and to initiate departmental proceedings against



delinquent officials, this Court vide order dated 29.09.2025, called upon the respondents to submit a status report.

2. Compliance report by way of affidavit of Dr. Manish Bansal, Director General Health Services, Haryana, has been filed on behalf of respondent No.4, which is taken on record.

3. A perusal of the affidavit shows that two separate enquiries have been conducted. The first enquiry was concluded and a report was submitted. A charge sheet was issued to Dr. Dinesh Malik, respondent No.7 and Dr. Sandeep Kumar SMO. The result of disciplinary proceedings is not on the record. An FIR bearing No.193 dated 18.07.2024 was lodged against respondent No.7, which was enquired into and on the basis of a final report submitted by investigating agency, FIR has been cancelled.

4. Insofar as the second enquiry is concerned, it was concluded by virtue of report dated 14.11.2025, Annexure R-2, wherein it has been categorically found that petitioner failed to submit any concrete evidence to support his allegation. However, while arriving at this conclusion, Enquiry Officer found that some officials were negligent in performing their duties and suggested that suitable action be taken against them, as deemed fit by the Committee.

5. After hearing the parties, this Court is of the view that writ petition seems to be a result of vindictiveness on the part of the petitioner, whose daughter was working as a Staff Nurse with PGIMS, Rohtak. It has been submitted that she was charge-sheeted, which was later dropped.



CWP-29233-2025

-3-

6.

In view of the above, this Court does not intend to proceed further with the writ petition, which is disposed of.
7.

Considering that a recommendation has been made by the Enquiry Officer, respondents are granted three months' time to apprise the Court about the action taken on the basis of enquiry report, Annexure R-2, as the outcome of the enquiry pending against respondent No.7.
8.

List on 01.04.2026 for the purposes of filing of a status report by official respondents.

28.01.2026  
*sheetal*

(SUVIR SEHGAL)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |