

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

**C.O.C.P. No.2111 of 2014
Date of Decision: 21.04.2017**

Shashi Kulbhushan Sharma

..... Petitioner

Versus

Dr. A.K.Bhandari, Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.S.Sandhu, Advocate for the respondent.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

This Court, while issuing notice of motion, had passed the following order:-

“ The petitioner had filed CWP No.7647 of 2014 in which the following order was passed by this Court on 24.4.2014:-

“Petitioner has filed this petition seeking a direction to the respondents to allow him to continue in service upto 65 years in view of UGC regulations.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner has moved representations (Annexure P- 10 and Annexure P-11) to the respondents for redressal of his grievance but no action has been taken on the same so far.

Accordingly, without adverting to the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 to dispose of the representations (Annexure P-10 and Annexure P-11), moved by the petitioner, expeditiously, in accordance with law, preferably within three month from the receipt of the certified copy of this order”.

In terms of the aforesaid order, the respondent University passed a detailed order No.864/R/DS dated

26.7.2014 and rejected the representation holding that the petitioner cannot be allowed to continue in service up to 65 years.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the directions contained in the main judgment in CWP No. 9665 of 2010 as also the representations made by him, have not been considered by the respondent at the time when the impugned order was passed.

Notice of motion for 03.11.2014. ”

At the time of hearing, learned Counsel for the respondent submits that the aforesaid directions have already been complied with. This fact is not disputed by learned opposite Counsel.

In view of the above, no further action is warranted.

Accordingly, the present contempt petition stands dismissed as infructuous.

April 21, 2017
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

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