



LPA-3757-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

325

LPA-3757-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 21.01.2026

Tejinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present:- Mr. Karanvir Singh Khehar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Arundhati Kulshreshtha, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.4.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)**CM-9245-LPA-2025**

Allowed as prayed for.

LPA-3757-2025

1. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that respondent No.4 had preferred a complaint against the appellant and in pursuance thereto, departmental proceedings were initiated against the appellant. He also submits that respondent No.4 had been erroneously impleaded as a party in the writ petition although he was not a necessary party. In support of his submission, he has relied upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Rajbir Singh Sekhon versus State of Punjab and others**, bearing LPA No.1545-2018, decided on 31.08.2022.



2. The Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Rajbir Singh Sekhon (supra)** has held as under:-

“13. The appellant filed complaint before the competent authorities to initiate departmental proceedings against the respondent. On the complaint of the appellant, Additional Chief Secretary, Punjab appointed Additional Sessions Judge (Retired) an enquiry officer. The Enquiry Officer reported that respondent has not committed any violation warranting major/minor penalty. The report of Enquiry Officer was accepted by the departmental authorities. On account of representations made by the appellant, official respondents have re-initiated enquiry proceedings. The respondent has challenged re-initiation of proceedings and the learned Single Judge had stayed the proceedings. The matter is purely between the departmental authorities and the respondent. It is the departmental authorities who have to decide the fate of the respondent. The appellant has no locus standi to participate in each and every proceeding initiated against the persons accused of commission of murder of son of the appellant as well as the respondent who appeared during the course of trial as defence witness. The present appellant has participated in appeal filed by the convicts before this Court as well as the appeals preferred before the Supreme Court. The appeal filed by the appellant has been dismissed by this Court as well as the Supreme Court. No substance in the averment of appellant has been found by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court as well as two Judge Bench of the Supreme Court. It is true that son of the appellant has been murdered and everybody has sympathy with the appellant. Nevertheless, appellant has no locus standi to participate in each and every proceeding initiated against the persons who were part of investigation or trial. Learned counsel for the appellant has failed to demonstrate locus standi of the appellant to participate in proceedings pending before the learned Single Judge.

14. Merely because the appellant has filed CWP No. 2642 of 2017 challenging the dropping off the proceedings which stands admitted, would not give him any locus standi to participate in the challenge raised to the re-initiation of enquiry proceedings by the government employee.

In view of the above findings, we do not find any merit in the instant appeal and it deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.”

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.4, upon instructions from respondent No.4, submits that he does not intend to participate in the proceedings and would withdraw from the proceedings by filing an affidavit in that regard tomorrow itself.

LPA-3757-2025 (O&M)

-3-

4. In view of the above, this LPA has been rendered infructuous and stands disposed of accordingly.
5. Pending application, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)

JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)

JUDGE

January 21, 2026

sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No