



2026:PHHC:061971



2026:PHHC:061971

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

CWP-12332-2026

Date of decision: 23.04.2026

Parvesh Yadav @ Pravesh Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Harsh Manocha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the order of termination dated 02.11.2025 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No.2 without holding departmental inquiry or giving any opportunity of hearing. Further, for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to reinstate the petitioner with continuity of service and all consequential benefits and also directing the respondents to consider and decide representation dated 15.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was appointed as Assistant Lineman (ALM) in the respondent-Corporation on 26.10.2012 as discernible from Annexure P-1. The service of the petitioner was terminated on 02.01.2015 without holding a regular departmental inquiry or giving any opportunity of hearing as discernible from



2026:PHHC:061971



2026:PHHC:061971

CWP-12332-2026**-2-**

Annexure P-2. He further submits that on the basis of inquiry report, an FIR was registered on 23.12.2015 under Sections 420/467/468/471 of IPC at Police Station Sector 7, Faridabad, on the complaint of Executive Engineer, Ballabgarh, alleging submission of false certificate of diploma in ITI. The petitioner was initially convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Faridabad vide judgment dated 21.02.2022, whereas, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, acquitted the petitioner of all charges vide judgment dated 21.09.2023 (Annexure P-3). Further, the Appellate Court specifically held that the prosecution has failed to prove the sanctity of the document Ex.P-3/A relied upon. The petitioner filed a detailed representation dated 15.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) before the competent authority seeking reinstatement with consequential benefits which remained unheeded.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation submits that the petitioner was dismissed from service on 02.01.2015 as discernible from Annexure P-2, whereas, the FIR (*supra*) was registered much later on 23.12.2015 and he was convicted by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class on 21.02.2022. It is not a case that petitioner was dismissed from service after he was convicted by the learned trial Court in FIR (*supra*) rather the credentials submitted by the petitioner were verified and during the verification, it transpires that the petitioner has claimed that he has acquired his diploma in ITI from Sh. Harkesh Vidya Updhyogick Prashikahan Sansthan Bilsuri, Buland Shahar. The information received from the Director State Vocational Institute Council, Uttar Pradesh Aligarh, Lucknow reveals that no institute in the name of Sh. Harkesh Vidya Updhyogick Prashikahan Sansthan Bilsuri, Buland



2026:PHHC:061971



2026:PHHC:061971

CWP-12332-2026

-3-

Shahar exists and the roll No.021859504 mentioned in the certificate has not been allotted by the council. Even the Matriculation certificate of the petitioner was got verified from the Education Board and it was conveyed that no such roll number has been allotted in the name of the petitioner. As such, the petitioner's service was terminated on account of non-fulfilment of the essential qualification and registration of FIR for submission of false and fabricated certificate was also recommended and it is a trite law that fraud vitiates all action and relies upon the judgment of this Court in CWP-4605-2025 titled as ***Kuldeep v. State of Haryana and others*** decide on 19.02.2025.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record with their able assistance, it transpires that that the petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Lineman (ALM) in the respondent-Nigam on 26.10.2012 and joined duties on 30.10.2012. During the process of verification of the petitioner's certificates, it was found that the documents submitted were fake and fabricated. Furthermore, the institute from which the petitioner claimed to have obtained the ITI diploma was found to be non-existent, as confirmed by the competent authority.

5. Consequently, in view of the aforesaid discussion and findings, the present civil writ petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby dismissed.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No