



12026:PHHC:074392

CWP-13597 of 2026

2026:PHHC:074392



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

CWP-13597 of 2026
Date of decision: 12.05.2026

Karamjit Singh Chander

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Tahaf Bains, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This 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 dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-10), whereby the appeal filed by the petitioner has been filed in the office without any order or opportunity of hearing, and also for quashing the order dated 18.09.2025/19.09.2025 (Annexure P-8), imposing a punishment of stoppage of one annual increment with future effect and also for quashing of the enquiry report dated 07.02.2025 (Annexure P-7).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that apart from other grounds which have been taken in the present writ petition, one of the grounds to challenge the order dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-10) passed by the Appellate Authority, whereby appeal against the order dated 18/19.09.2025 (Annexure P-8) vide which punishment of stoppage of one increment with cumulative effect has been imposed



2026:PHHC:074392

CWP-13597 of 2026

2026:PHHC:074392



upon the petitioner, is that the same is cryptic and non-speaking order as none of the points raised in the appeal have been considered and dealt with. He submits that the said order is liable to be set aside and the matter may be remanded back to the Appellate Authority for reconsideration and its decision on merits.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel could not justify the passing of the impugned order by the Appellate Authority which is totally cryptic and non-speaking.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant documents.

5. The order dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-10) passed by the Appellate Authority reads as under :-

“Government of Punjab
Cooperative Department
(Cooperative-2 Branch)

To

Sh. Karamjit Singh,
Inspector Audit Cooperative Societies
Khamanon, Now C.B. Malod through Chief Auditor
Cooperative Societies, Punjab.
Chandigarh

Memo No.Coop/3/2025-Cooperation2-(5)/
Chandigarh Dated: -

Subject: Regarding filing appeal against the order of
penalization. Sh. Karamjit Singh Chander, Inspector
Audit Cooperative Societies Khamanon now C.B.
Malod

In regard to the above subject, you are written in
connection with the appeal filed to the Hon’ble Chief Minister,
Punjab as Incharge Cooperative Minister, Punjab on 06.11.2025,
that after considering the appeal dated 06.11.2025 the competent
authority has ordered to file the same in the office”

Sd/-
Superintendent Grade-I”



6. Perusal of the order reproduced above would show that none of the points raised by the petitioner in his appeal dated 06.11.2025 (Annexure P-9) have been considered and decided by the Appellate Authority.

7. The respondents-authorities were under legal obligation to assign cogent reasons while passing the impugned order dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-10) so that this Court, while exercising its power of judicial review, would be in a position to know as to what were the reasons weighing in the mind of the authority, while passing the impugned order. It is so said because the aim of the rules of natural justice is to secure justice or to put it negatively to prevent miscarriage of justice. Since the horizon of natural justice has been constantly expanding in the recent past, hardly any visible distinction is left in the functioning of the administrative and quasi-judicial bodies, so far as the necessity of recording the reasons is concerned. That is why reasons are called the soul of a judgment.

8. The above-said view taken by this Court also finds support from the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ram Phal v. State of Haryana : 2009(1) SCC (L&S) 645***. The relevant observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para 6 of the judgment *ibid*, which can be gainfully followed in the present case, read as under:-

“The duty to give reasons for coming to a decision is of decisive importance which cannot be lawfully disregarded. The giving of the satisfactory reasons is required by the ordinary man's sense of justice and also a



*healthy discipline for all those who exercise power over others. This Court in **Raj Kishore Jha v. State of Bihar and others, (2003) 11 SCC 519** has stated:*

19....Reason is the heartbeat of every conclusion. Without the same, it becomes lifeless.”

9. Again, while dealing with the question of demarcation between the administrative orders and quasi-judicial orders and the requirement of adherence to natural justice as well as recording reasons, the Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down the broad guidelines in this regard, in the case of **Kranti Associates Private Limited and another Vs. Masood Ahmed Khan and others : (2010) 9 SCC 496**. The relevant observations made in para 51 of the judgment, which aptly apply in the present case, read as under:-

“51. Summarizing the above discussion, this Court holds :

(a) In India the judicial trend has always been to record reasons, even in administrative decisions, if such decisions affect anyone prejudicially.

(b) A quasi-judicial authority must record reasons in support of its conclusions.

(c) Insistence on recording of reasons is meant to serve the wider principle of justice that justice must not only be done it must also appear to be done as well.

(d) Recording of reasons also operates as a valid restraint on any possible arbitrary exercise of judicial and quasi-judicial or even administrative power.

(e) Reasons reassure that discretion has been exercised by the decision-maker on relevant grounds and by disregarding extraneous considerations.

(f) Reasons have virtually become as indispensable a component of a decision-making process as observing principles of natural justice by judicial, quasi-judicial and even by administrative bodies.

(g) Reasons facilitate the process of judicial review by superior Courts.



(h) The ongoing judicial trend in all countries committed to rule of law and constitutional governance is in favour of reasoned decisions based on relevant facts. This is virtually the lifeblood of judicial decision-making justifying the principle that reason is the soul of justice.

(i) Judicial or even quasi-judicial opinions these days can be as different as the judges and authorities who deliver them. All these decisions serve one common purpose which is to demonstrate by reason that the relevant factors have been objectively considered. This is important for sustaining the litigants' faith in the justice delivery system.

(j) Insistence on reason is a requirement for both judicial accountability and transparency.

(k) If a Judge or a quasi-judicial authority is not candid enough about his/her decision-making process then it is impossible to know whether the person deciding is faithful to the doctrine of precedent or to principles of incrementalism.

(l) Reasons in support of decisions must be cogent, clear and succinct. A pretence of reasons or 'rubber-stamp reasons' is not to be equated with a valid decision making process.

(m) It cannot be doubted that transparency is the sine qua non of restraint on abuse of judicial powers. Transparency in decision making not only makes the judges and decision makers less prone to errors but also makes them subject to broader scrutiny. (See David Shapiro in Defence of Judicial Candor (1987) 100 Harward Law Review 731-737).

*(n) Since the requirement to record reasons emanates from the broad doctrine of fairness in decision-making, the said requirement is now virtually a component of human rights and was considered part of Strasbourg Jurisprudence. See (1994) 19 EHRR 553, at 562 para 29 and **Anyia v. University of Oxford, 2001 EWCA Civ 405**, wherein the Court referred to Article 6 of European Convention of Human Rights which requires, "adequate and intelligent reasons must be given for judicial decisions".*

(o) In all common law jurisdictions judgments play a vital role in setting up precedents for the future. Therefore, for



development of law, requirement of giving reasons for the decision is of the essence and is virtually a part of "Due Process".

10. Same view was taken in the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Chairman, Disciplinary Authority, Rani Lakshmi Bai Kshetriya Gramin Bank Vs. Jagdish Sharan Varshney and others : 2009(4) SCC 240***. The relevant portion of said judgment is reproduced as under :-

*“7. In our opinion, an order of affirmation need not contain as elaborate reasons as an order of reversal but that does not mean that the order of affirmation need not contain any reasons whatsoever. In fact, the said decision in Prabhu Dayal Grover’s case (supra) has itself stated that the appellate order should disclose application of mind. Whether there was an application of mind or not can only be disclosed by some reasons, at least in brief, mentioned in the order of the appellate authority. Hence, we cannot accept the proposition that an order of affirmation need not contain any reasons at all. That order must contain some reasons, at least in brief, so that one can know whether the appellate authority has applied its mind while affirming the order of the disciplinary authority. The view we are taking was also taken by this Court in **Divisional Forest Officer v. Madhusudan Rao, JT 2008 (2) SC 253** (vide para 19), and in **Madhya Pradesh Industries Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1966 Supreme Court 671**, **Siemens Engineering & Manufacturing Co. Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1976 Supreme Court 1785** (vide para 6), etc.*

8. *In the present case, since the appellate authority's order does not contain any reasons, it does not show any application of mind.*

9. *The purpose of disclosure of reasons, as held by a Constitution Bench of this Court in **S.N. Mukherjee v. Union of India reported in (1990) 4 SCC 594**, is that people must have confidence in the judicial or quasi-judicial authorities.*



10. *Unless reasons are disclosed, how can a person know whether the authority has applied its mind or not? Also, giving of reasons minimises the chances of arbitrariness. Hence, it is an essential requirement of the rule of law that some reasons, at least in brief, must be disclosed in a judicial or quasi-judicial order, even if it is an order of affirmation.*

No doubt, in **S.N. Mukherjee's case** (supra), it has been observed that :

“... The appellate or revisional authority, if it affirms such an order, need not give separate reasons if the appellate or revisional authority agrees with the reasons contained in the order under challenge.”

11. *The above observation, in our opinion, really means that the order of affirmance need not contain an elaborate reasoning as contained in the order of the original authority, but it cannot be understood to mean that even brief reasons need not be given in an order of affirmance. To take a contrary view would mean that appellate authorities can simply dismiss appeals by one line orders stating that they agree with the view of the lower authority.*

12. *For the same reason, the decision of this Court in **State of Madras v. Srinivasan, AIR 1966 Supreme Court 1827** (vide para 15) has also to be understood as explained by us above.*

13. *Hence, we agree with the High Court that reasons should have been contained in the appellate authority's order.”*

11. Similar view has been taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ram Chander Vs. Union of India and others : 1986(3) SCC 103**, **Sengara Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others : 1983(4) SCC 225**, **State of U.P Vs. Raj Pal Singh : 2002(1) SCT 205** as well as in the judgments of this Court in **Gulab Singh Vs. Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak and others : 2005(1) PLR 440**, **State of Punjab Vs. Pargat Singh through LRs : 2004(3) RSJ 604**, **Nafe Singh Vs.**



2026:PHHC:074392

CWP-13597 of 2026

2026:PHHC:074392



Haryana Land Reclamation and Development Corporation Ltd. and others : 2016(1) SCT 212 and Pritam Singh Vs. Haryana State Electricity Board : 1995(2) SCT 754.

12. Reverting back to the facts of the case in hand and following the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court, it is unhesitatingly held that since the appellate order is cryptic and non-speaking, it cannot be sustained. The respondents- authorities have failed to discharge their legal obligation and acted in violation of the above-said guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court, therefore, impugned order dated 12.02.2026 cannot be sustained for this reason.

13. In view of the facts as mentioned and position of law as discussed above, the present petition is allowed. Impugned order dated 12.02.2026 (Annexure P-10), passed by the Appellate Authority is set-aside and the case is remanded to the Appellate Authority for fresh consideration and decision on merits in view of the observations made hereinabove and to pass a well-reasoned speaking order after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner, in accordance with law, within a period of three months from today.

12.05.2026

R.S.

**(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No