



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

CWP-24110-2016

Date of Decision: 12.05.2025

Inspector Amit Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent not to proceed with the departmental enquiry initiated during the pendency of criminal trial in FIR No.269 dated 02.05.2016 under Sections 306, 34 IPC, P.S. Surajkund, District Faridabad.

2. Mr. Manish Soni, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of instant petition, the petitioner has already been acquitted in the criminal case. The department examined its witnesses while he was in custody. The charge sheet was also issued when he was in custody.

3. Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana expressed her inability to controvert aforesaid facts.

4. Considering the mandate of Rule 16.3 of Punjab Police Rules, 1934 (as made applicable to the State of Haryana) (in short 'PPR'), instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the Commissioner of Police, Faridabad to decide status of departmental proceedings in the light of Rule 16.3 of PPR. If the



Commissioner comes to a conclusion that departmental proceedings may continue despite petitioner's acquittal in criminal case, a reasoned order shall be passed.

12.05.2025

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

shivani

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes

Whether reportable

No