



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

\*\*\*\*

**CWP-15884-2000 (O&M)**  
**Date of Decision: 08.09.2025**

Randhir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. Amrinder Pratap Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

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

1.            The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to treat him retired from service w.e.f. 07.10.1999 i.e. the date on which he completed 58 years of age and release consequential benefits.

2.            The petitioner was convicted by trial Court vide judgment dated 19.09.1974. He was awarded sentence of 10 years. He came to be dismissed from service vide order dated 23.08.1978. He preferred an appeal against order of dismissal. The Appellate Authority vide order dated 07.11.1978 set aside order dated 23.08.1978, however, he was ordered to be placed under suspension. The Appellate Authority set aside order of dismissal on the sole ground that appeal against conviction is pending before High Court. The Disciplinary Authority after dismissal of appeal by High Court vide order dated 28.05.1979 again dismissed him from service.

3. It is undisputed fact that petitioner was subjected to imprisonment of 10 years. He had undergone said imprisonment. He received subsistence allowance from the date of his suspension to date of order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP filed by State against orders passed by this Court in Regular Second Appeal.

4. The petitioner was convicted vide judgment dated 19.09.1974. As per Rule 16.2 of Punjab Police Rules, 1934, he was liable to be dismissed from service. Despite conviction, he received subsistence allowance till the date of dismissal of SLP by Hon'ble Supreme Court. The SLP was dismissed on 03.01.1994 meaning thereby petitioner received salary/subsistence allowance from September' 1974 to January' 1994. The petitioner had already received a substantive benefit. He does not deserve any further benefit.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**08.09.2025**

*Prince Chawla*

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