

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

**R.A. No.10 of 2017 (O&M) in
CWP No.3828 of 2015
Date of Decision.19.01.2017**

Raj Kumar General Secretary

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. DAG, Haryana
for the applicants-respondents.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The review of the order dated 03.03.2015 has been sought with regard to direction issued to comply with the instructions dated 07.09.2012 on the ground that the aforementioned instructions have already been withdrawn.

The review application is accompanied by application of condonation of delay of 618 days in filing the review application. Regarding withdrawal of the instructions, reference has been made to Annexure A-2. On going through Annexure A-2, it revealed that order regarding withdrawal of instruction had been passed on 24.08.2015 whereas the order sought to be reviewed was passed on 03.03.2015, in essence, the instructions were in vogue at that relevant point of time. There is no indication in the letter that the same had been withdrawn with retrospective effect.

The filing of the review application at the instance of the State is none else but an attempt to harass the petitioner, as it has been brought to the notice of the Court during the hearing of the application regarding the explanation of delay that the non-applicant/petitioner had filed a contempt

petition. It is strange that the officers at the helm of affairs do not comply with the directions given by this Court, much less, have no regard or respect to the orders passed by this Court and compel the other parties to approach this Court in contempt proceedings, resulting into wastage of time, non-adherence to the order and as well as expenditure of more money.

The aforementioned act of the concerned department is most deplorable and not appreciated. Resultantly, the review petition is dismissed on the ground of limitation as well as on merits, with costs of ₹20,000/- to be paid to the petitioner and recovered from the concerned officer who was instrumental in not implementing the directions given by this Court and moved the review application without looking into the contents of the letter (Annexure A-2) in accordance with law.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

January 19, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes

Whether reportable Yes