

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

COCP No.1514 of 2015

Date of Decision: 01.08.2017

Satbir Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Nitin Kumar Yadav and another

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. V.D. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Indu Bala, Advocate
for Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate
for the respondents.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

The present contempt petition has been filed only on the ground that the pay of the petitioner has not been re-fixed as per order dated 27.04.2012.

It has been argued that on 01.04.1997, the petitioner was getting salary of ₹ 4300/-, whereas, on 10.10.1997, his salary was reduced to ₹ 4000/-.

In pursuance to notice of motion, reply has been filed by the respondents, wherein, it has been stated that the pay of the petitioner has rightly be re-fixed as it was a case of fresh appointment and not a case of reduction of basic pay of the petitioner. Earlier pay of the petitioner was not to be taken into consideration while re-fixing his pay on the post of ALM

with effect from 10.10.1997.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has also not been able to show as to how it was a case of pay protection in case of fresh appointment.

Accordingly, it cannot be a case of contempt as the direction was only to re-fix the pay of the petitioner and that has been complied with.

No ground is made out to initiate contempt proceedings against the respondents.

The petition is accordingly dismissed.

However, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by not protecting the pay which he was drawing earlier, he is at liberty to move representation to the authorities concerned.

01.08.2017
gupreet

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No