

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

COCF No.11 of 2016(O&M)

Date of Decision:-20.01.2017

Brij Mohan Chahda.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

**Shiv Dular Singh Dhillon, IAS, Director Food & Civil Supply &
Consumer Affair, Punjab.**

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Present contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner against the respondent for not complying with the order dated 27.05.2015 passed by this Court in CWP No.11033 of 2015 whereby the claim of the petitioner for grant of interest on delayed payment of retiral benefits was disposed of by passing the following order:-

“ By way of the present writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought grant of interest on the delayed payment of retiral dues.

The learned counsel contends that the petitioner retired from service on 31.10.2010, whereas, the retiral benefits have been paid on 30.04.2015 after a period of 4½ years. He further submits that at this stage, the petitioner will be satisfied if the present petition is treated as a

representation and the respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioner in terms of the law laid down in The Financial Commissioner, Haryana Vs. Hasan Singh Kanwar, 2010(1) SLR 788; Daya Singh Vs. State of Haryana, 2014(3) S.C.T. 211; D.D. Tiwari Vs. UHBVNL, 2014(3) SCC 894; and A.J.S. Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab, 1997(3) S.C.T. 468.

In the circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for release of interest on the delayed payment, within four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, and in case, the same is covered by the aforesaid authorities (supra), interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of retirement, till the payment of the retiral dues be paid to him within two months thereafter.

Disposed of. ”

Upon notice no reply has been filed, however, it is submitted that the present contempt has become infructuous as the order dated 27.05.2015 passed by this Court has since been complied with which is conceded by learned Counsel for the petitioner.

Dismissed as infructuous.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

January 20, 2017
Vinay

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>