



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

LPA No.432 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 02.09.2025

KEWAL SINGH RANDHAWA

.....Appellant

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. R.S. Bal, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. A.S. Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

* * * * *

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

CM-6345-LPA-2025

This is an application for amendment/correction in the head note along with the prayer clause of the main appeal, as inadvertently the judgment dated 01.11.2019 passed in CWP-30982-2019 had not been challenged.

Issue notice to the respondents.

Mr. A.S. Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that he has no objection, if the application is allowed.

Vide order dated 13.02.2025, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court had passed the following order:



“Order dated 21.11.2024, whereby CM-19611-CWP of 2019 and CM-19613-CWP of 2019 in CWP No.30982 of 2019 filed by appellant were disposed of as not pressed with liberty to avail appropriate remedy of appeal challenging order passed in CWP No.30982 of 2019, is under challenge in this appeal. However, there is no challenge to order dated 01.11.2019 passed in CWP No.30982 of 2019.

At this stage, learned counsel for the appellant seeks an adjournment.

At request, adjourned to 28.04.2025.”

In view of the above and for the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. Amended head note and amended prayer clause annexed with the application are taken on record.

Main Appeal

This appeal is directed against the judgment of the Single Bench dated 01.11.2019, whereby the writ petition preferred by the appellant impugning the order dated 18.06.2019 (Annexure P-1), vide which punishment of withholding of one annual increment without cumulative effect had been imposed, has been dismissed. Challenge has also been laid to the order dated 21.11.2024 passed by the Single Bench in CM-19613-CWP-2019, whereby the application seeking recalling of order dated 01.11.2019, has been disposed of as having been not pressed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that there was no material to substantiate the charges against him. The appellant was working as the Principal, Govt. Girls Senior Secondary School, Rayya and had been maintaining discipline among the teachers. However, one of the teachers i.e., respondent no.2 nursed a grudge against the appellant as he was maintaining



strict discipline and had levelled false and frivolous allegations against him. He also submits that the Inquiry Officer was 15 years junior to the appellant and was biased against him. The appellant was not afforded any opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses, who had deposed against him.

3. Heard.

4. The charges against the appellant were that when he was posted as Principal, Govt. Girls Senior Secondary School, Rayya, he had harassed respondent No.2 on the pretext that at the time of her transfer, she had not handed over the record of the 'CCE Register of Class 8th B for the year 2014-15' and the appellant did not complete the service book of respondent No.2 for a period of four years and had instead kept it in the school in an unauthorized manner. Respondent No.3 was appointed as the Inquiry Officer, who after recording the evidence and affording an opportunity to the appellant had arrived at findings of fact that the charges against the appellant stood proved. Vide the impugned order the punishment of withholding of one annual increment without cumulative effect was imposed on the appellant.

5. We do not find any merit in the contention of learned counsel for the appellant that respondent No.3-Inquiry Officer was his junior and that he was not afforded opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses for the reason that it is not borne out from the material on record that at any time, during the departmental proceedings the appellant had raised the plea that there is an apprehension of bias on the part of the Inquiry Officer as he was



junior to the appellant or that he had sought an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses, which was denied to him.

6. The Inquiry Officer after appreciation of evidence had recorded findings of fact and the charges were proved. It is trite that the findings of the Inquiry Officer are not to be lightly interfered with. Reference can be made to the judgments of Supreme Court in the cases of *State Bank of India Versus Ram Lal Bhaskar, (2011) 10 SCC 249* and *State of Rajasthan Versus Bhupendra Singh, AIR 2024 SC 4034*.

7. In view of the above, we do not find any manifest illegality in the impugned judgment dismissing the writ petition preferred by the appellant challenging the imposition of punishment of withholding one annual increment without cumulative effect. Consequently, the Letters Patent Appeal being devoid of any merit stands dismissed.

8. All pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

02.09.2025
sandeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No