

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

COCF No.2267 of 2015

Date of Decision : 4.9.2015

A.K.Srivastva

....Petitioner

Versus

Shekhar Vidyarthi

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

....

Present: Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MAHESH GROVER.J.

The writ court had set aside the order impugned in the writ petition on the ground that the petitioner had not been heard. While disposing of the writ petition, liberty was granted to the disciplinary authority to consider the reply of the petitioner and take a decision thereon within a period of two months.

It is the conceded position that an order has been passed by the disciplinary authority.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is verbatim the same as Annexure P-4. I have perused the order Annexure P-4 passed by the disciplinary authority. In my view the contention raised by the petitioner is incorrect. The order passed by the disciplinary authority is a detailed one giving sufficient reasons for the petitioner to contest by way of a judicial

scrutiny in the appropriate proceedings. No case for contempt would, however, be made out simply on the premise that the disciplinary authority has not agreed with the petitioner and has chosen to agree with the findings of the Inquiry Officer.

Dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to pursue his remedy in accordance with law.

4.9.2015
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE