



**Rambir**

....Petitioner

vs.

**State of Haryana and others**

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. S.S.Sahu, Advocate  
for the petitioner

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Addl. A.G., Haryana

\*\*\*

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

1. On 20.08.2025, the following order was passed by this Court:-

*1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 16.10.2023 (Annexure P-3) whereby representation against adverse remarks recorded in ACR for the period from 27.04.2018 to 20.02.2019 was rejected. He is further seeking setting aside of order dated 22.01.2025 (Annexure P-4) whereby second representation was rejected. He is also seeking direction to respondent to consider claim of petitioner for promotion as Assistant Sub Inspector (ASI) in view of the fact that Director General of Police (DGP) vide order dated 09.06.2025 has reduced punishment of stoppage of annual increments.*

*2. The petitioner was enrolled as Constable in Haryana Police Force. In October' 2016, he was posted as Head Constable at Police Choki Sasrauli. One person namely*



*Satbir Singh filed complaint dated 13.10.2016 against his relatives alleging that they have caused injuries to him. The respondent-department initiated departmental proceedings against petitioner alleging that he has failed to act upon complaint. In the inquiry, he was found guilty. The Disciplinary Authority awarded punishment of stoppage of three increments with permanent effect. He unsuccessfully preferred appeal before Appellate Authority. He further preferred revision before DGP who vide order dated 09.06.2025 reduced quantum of punishment. The punishment of stoppage of three annual increments with permanent effect was substituted by stoppage of two future annual increments with temporary effect. The Reporting Authority recorded adverse remarks in his ACR for the period from 27.04.2018 to 20.02.2019. He preferred representation against adverse remarks. The said representation was rejected vide order dated 16.10.2023. He preferred second representation which came to be rejected vide memo dated 22.01.2025 on the ground that second representation cannot be entertained beyond 45 days from the date of receipt of order of first representation. The petitioner has submitted second representation after 01 year, 02 months and 14 days from the date of receipt of order of first representation.*

3. *Mr. Sukhvir Singh Sahu, Advocate seeks time to bring on record regulation/instructions issued by DGP or any other authority to the effect that second representation with respect to adverse ACR is maintainable. He will also bring on record that after rejection of his first representation, he filed second representation within 45 days before one or another authority.*



4. *Learned State counsel will also clarify position with respect to second representation.*

5. *Adjourned to 04.09.2025."*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the instant petition with liberty to file afresh with better particulars.

3. Dismissed as withdrawn with aforesaid liberty.

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

**16.10.2025**  
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No