



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117

CWP-28541-2025(O&M)

Decided On: 26.09.2025

DR. RAVI SHANKAR

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

CM-14602-CWP-2025

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed.

Annexures P-17 to P-22 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

Main Case

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the chargesheet dated 13/19.03.2025, Annexure P-5, on the ground that on the same charges the petitioner was earlier issued chargesheeted dated 16.11.2023, Annexure P-17, which was dropped by the Department later vide order dated 27.09.2024, Annexure P-4. Therefore, the impugned chargesheet is liable to be set aside as the charges which have already been dropped cannot be inquired into again by the Department.

2. A perusal of the chagesheet, dated 16.11.2023, shows that it was based upon a complaint, dated 08.02.2023, received against the petitioner and a few of his colleagues, which was looked into by a fact finding inquiry committee. Based upon its report, the chargesheet was issued to him for



performing duty in a negligent and irresponsible manner, and for having committed acts unbecoming of a Government Officer in violation of Rules 4 and 5 of the Haryana Civil Services (Government Employees Conduct) Rules, 2016. The impugned chargesheet has, however, been issued on a complaint dated 05.04.2024 received by the College Principal on 08.04.2024 from three women and one male staff members of the Government College for Women, Cheeka, Kaithal, where the petitioner is presently posted. A perusal whereof shows that the first charge relates to objectionable behaviour of the petitioner towards women staff of the College; the second charge relates to his failure to improve his conduct and behaviour despite repeated instructions by the Principal; and the third charge relates to misleading local media houses and spoiling the image of the College.

3. Apparently, there is no similarity so far as the previous charges and the instant ones are concerned. Accordingly, dropping of the previous chargesheet will have no bearing on the impugned chargesheet.

4. Dismissed.

26.09.2025

Ad

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No