



LPA-1806-2025 (O&M)

Page 1 of 2

118

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

LPA-1806-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 03.07.2025

AJIT SINGH

. . . . Appellant

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

. . . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. S.K. Verma, Advocate
for the appellant.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. Present appeal has been filed by the appellant/writ petitioner against the judgment dated 13.05.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.
2. The consistent view of this Division Bench has been that in cases where there are two parallel proceedings, namely departmental as well as criminal, both can continue without being affected by one another, as held by this Court in *LPA-1146-2024 titled as 'ASI Pawan Kumar vs. State of Haryana and others, decided on 08.05.2024*, and earlier view taken by the Coordinate Bench of this Court *in LPA-1255-2024 titled as 'Tulsi Dass vs. State of Haryana and others', decided on 22.05.2024*.
3. This Court in *ASI Pawan Kumar (supra)*, held as under:

"5. We have carefully considered the submissions and found that the learned Single Judge, has before dealing each case, examined the law governing the issue at length and after having culled out the law as to whether departmental proceedings can be allowed to run concurrently with the criminal proceedings; he has thus examined each case on fact. In the present case, we find



LPA-1806-2025 (O&M)

Page 2 of 2

that the charge sheet issued to the petitioner mentions the following allegations for which the departmental proceedings are required to be conducted namely “demanding bribe and not joining the investigation”.

*6. This Court is satisfied that the said aspect cannot be examined in the criminal case and departmental proceedings therefore need not be stayed or stalled during the criminal case. The law does not require departmental proceedings otherwise be stayed. In view of the settled law in **Capt. M. Paul Anthony v. Bharat God Mines Ltd.**” reported as **1999 (3) SCC 679**, the present appeal is dismissed.”*

4. We notice that the learned Single Judge has followed our orders. We, therefore, find no reason to interfere with the same.
5. Keeping in view above, present appeal stands dismissed.
6. All pending applications also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

03.07.2025

Mohit goyal

1. *Whether speaking/reasoned?*
2. *Whether reportable?*

Yes/No
Yes/No