

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

COCN No. 1219 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 25.04.2017

Satish Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Harsh Kumar Bhanwala, Chairman,
National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development
(NABARD), Mumbai and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepender Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner was charge-sheeted for alleged acts of omission and commission on his part and subsequently dismissed from his services. The appeal filed by the petitioner was also dismissed by the Appellate Authority. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner, by way of writ petition bearing *CWP No. 22244 of 2010*, had prayed for setting aside the order dated 27.11.2008, passed by respondent No. 3 therein vide which he had been ordered to be dismissed from service with immediate effect, as also order dated 06.08.2009 passed by the Appellate Authority (respondent No. 2 therein), whereby the appeal filed by the petitioner against the order of dismissal was dismissed. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances, this Court vide order dated 23.04.2015 (**Annexure P-1**), passed in aforesaid writ

petition, quashed the disciplinary proceedings, enquiry report, the order of dismissal and the order rejecting the department appeal. It was also held that the petitioner shall be entitled for all the consequential benefits.

Since the petitioner was not granted all the consequential benefits, hence the present contempt petition.

Upon notice, reply on behalf of respondents has been filed, wherein in para No. 3, it is stated that the petitioner has already been reinstated in service on 14.05.2015 and the Bank has also disbursed total amount of Rs. 41,63,985.50/- towards the arrears of salary and other benefits as on 31.08.2016 to which the petitioner is entitled.

In view of above, learned counsel for the parties state that the order dated 23.04.2015 **(P-1)** stands complied with, therefore, no further action in the present contempt is warranted as the same has become infructuous.

Dismissed as infructuous.

As far as the claim for further promotion of the petitioner is concerned, that would be independent cause of action, therefore, he is free to challenge the same as per legal remedy available to him.

April 25, 2017

'dk kamra'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No