

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

LPA No.860 of 2015

Date of Decision:- 29.05.2015.

Dr. (Ms.) Urmila Rao

.....Appellant

Versus

Vijai Vardhan and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. Mukesh Rao, Advocate for the appellant.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

1.) This Letters Patent Appeal impugns the order dated 12.05.2015 whereby learned Single Judge has dismissed the contempt petition filed by the appellant.

2.) We have serious reservations against the maintainability of this appeal against the above mentioned order.

3.) Be that as it may, it is apparent from the order dated December 12, 2013, passed by a Division Bench of this Court to which one of us (Surya Kant, J.) was a member that the appellant was permitted to represent the competent authority, namely, the State Government as well as the Managing Committee in respect of

the claims which were not specifically raised by her in the writ petition.

4.) The contempt court has observed that the representation made by the appellant with deference to the above referred directions, has been rejected by passing a speaking order.

5.) In such like situation, the effective remedy for the appellant for the grant of any relief, which according to her, has been erroneously denied, would be to challenge the above stated speaking order or the action or inaction of the authorities before an appropriate adjudicatory forum. Contempt proceedings are not the remedy for enforcement of such like rights.

6.) With liberty aforementioned, appeal is disposed of.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

May 29, 2015.

sandeep sethi