

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

**C.O.C.P. No.2712 of 2016  
Date of Decision: 11.05.2017**

Parkash Chand

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

Sh. G.S.Wassan, Chief Engineer, Ranjit Sagar Dam,  
Shahpurkandi Towanship, Pathankot and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH**

Present: Mr. M.K.Dogra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)**

This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 24.10.2016, had passed the following order:-

*“ It is the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that the writ petition preferred by the petitioner i.e. CWP No.7406 of 2015 titled as Parkash Chand Versus State of Punjab and others was decided by this Court by order dated 28.04.2011 in terms of judgment passed by this Court in CWP No.5568 of 2008 titled as Charan Dass and others Versus State of Punjab and others on 27.05.2009, whereby directions were issued to the respondents to re-fix the pay of the petitioners and in case of those employees, who have already been retired from service, the retiral benefits were to be released within a period of two months. The petitioners were also held entitled to interest on the delayed payment of pension/retiral benefits at the statutory rate wherever admissible and at the rate of 6% on pension and other retiral benefits where statutory interest is not provided for. The amount deducted from the retiral benefits or the salary of the petitioners was also directed to be refunded within the above said period. Counsel contends that although the petitioner has been granted the benefit of increments which he had claimed but the consequential benefits have not been released. Counsel, thus, contends that respondent No.1 has not complied with the order passed by this Court on 28.04.2011 in toto rendering himself liable to be proceeded against under the Contempt of*

*Courts Act, 1971. He places reliance upon notice of motion issued by this Court in similar contempt petition i.e. COCP No.2930 of 2015 titled as Joginder Singh Versus Jagmohan Singh and another.*

*Let notice be issued to respondent No.1 for 23.11.2016 to show cause as to why contempt proceedings be not initiated against him.*

*Dasti only.*

*Reply to the contempt petition be filed within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of notice with an advance copy to counsel for the petitioner.*

*In case the reply is not filed within the stipulated time, the same shall be received by the Registry on payment of ₹ 10,000/- as costs to be deposited in the account of Lawyers' Welfare Fund, High Court.*

*Copy of this order be sent to the said respondent along with notice for information and compliance.*

*To be listed along with COCP No.2930 of 2015. ”*

Upon notice, reply has been filed, wherein it is submitted that all the retiral dues along with refund of recovered amount have since been paid to the petitioner vide Office Order dated 03.08.2015 (**Annexure R-1**).

At the time of hearing, learned Counsel for the respondents submits that the present petition has become infructuous as the directions passed by this Court stand complied with.

In response, learned Counsel for the petitioner concedes the aforesaid factual submission.

Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed as infructuous.

**May 11, 2017**

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)  
JUDGE**

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