

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

COCP No.2256 of 2013

Date of Decision: 12.09.2017

Satpal Singla

....Petitioner

Versus

Mrs. Vini Mahajan and another

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Ms. Anna Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anu Chatrath, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

The writ petition bearing ***CWP No.14095 of 1999*** titled as ***Amarjit Singh vs The State of Punjab and others*** filed by the petitioner was allowed vide order dated ***03.04.2002***. Certain benefits were released to the petitioner. Subsequently, the time was sought by learned counsel for the petitioner to get instructions as to what benefits have been granted to the petitioner and what benefits have not been granted to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits the benefit of selection grade has not been granted to the petitioner, whereas, he was entitled for the same.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that said benefit has not even been granted to the petitioners, who filed ***CWP No.14095 of 1999*** and a specific affidavit was filed that the petitioner is also not entitled for that benefit.

On perusal of order dated 28.08.2012, it is apparent that the claim of the petitioner was allowed in terms of order dated 03.04.2002 passed in Civil Writ Petition No.14095 of 1999. Nothing was mentioned as to what benefits were to be granted to the petitioner. The benefits which have been granted to petitioner-Amarjit Singh, who filed CWP No.14095 of 1999, have also been granted to the petitioner.

No ground is made out to continue with the contempt petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

However, in case, the petitioner has filed any representation, the respondents are at liberty to take action on the same and convey the order passed to the petitioner preferably within a period of two months.

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

12.09.2017
gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No