



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

123

CWP-33771-2025

Date of Decision: 19.03.2026

BIKRAM SINGH @ VIKRAM SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Ms. Aarti Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, Assistant 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 12.06.2024 whereby Deputy Commissioner dropped charges against Kanoongos namely Bhupinder Singh and Rajinder Sharma.

2. Patwari-Harpreet Singh was caught red-handed by Vigilance Team while accepting bribe on 08.06.2023. FIR No.15 dated 08.06.2023 was registered against him. The respondent initiated departmental inquiry against Bhupinder Singh and Rajinder Sharma. The Inquiry Officer held Bhupinder Singh guilty of misconduct. The Disciplinary Authority vide order dated 12.06.2024 has dropped the charges.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Inquiry Officer found Bhupinder Singh guilty of misconduct still disciplinary authority dropped charges against Bhupinder Singh and Rajinder Sharma.

4. On the complaint of petitioner, FIR was registered against Patwari-Harpreet Singh. The Investigating Agency conducted investigation and filed its reply under Section 173 Cr.P.C. The trial Court found Patwari-Harpreet Singh guilty and awarded punishment. The petitioner is claiming that Kanoongos Bhupinder Singh and Rajinder Sharma were also accused. He could very well file application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. seeking summoning of additional accused. He did not avail said remedy. The respondent conducted departmental enquiry against Bhupinder Singh and Rajinder Sharma. The Inquiry Officer found Bhupinder Singh guilty of misconduct, however, disciplinary authorities dropped the charges. The petitioner has no locus standi to challenge before this Court findings recorded by disciplinary authorities. The petitioner by not moving application under Section 319 Cr.P.C acquiesced action of investigating agency. He wants to implicate the private respondents by one or another way.

5. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 19, 2026
Deepak DPA

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