

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 119 of 2016

Date of decision : April 18, 2018

Madan Lal and others

..... Petitioner

Versus

D. P. Reddy & others

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Daya Chaudhary, J (oral).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during pendency of the present petition, the claim of the petitioner has been considered and order dated 19.10.2016 has been passed.

On perusal of the aforesaid order, it shows that in one para it has been mentioned that the matter is still under consideration with the Finance Department and no decision has been taken till date and as and when the decision is taken, in this regard, the same shall be implemented meticulously. In the end it has been mentioned that claim of the petitioner has been considered and claim of enhancement of HRA and medical allowance has been rejected. It appears from the aforesaid order that total claim of the petitioner has not been accepted as mentioned in the representation and claim has been accepted partly.

Accordingly, the respondent-authority is also directed to

case, the petitioner is found to be entitled for the relief claimed, the same be granted. In case the petitioner is not found to be entitled for the same, the respondent-authority is directed to pass a detailed speaking order within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of the order.

If the petitioner is aggrieved in any manner, he is at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

The Contempt Petition is accordingly disposed of.

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

April 18, 2018
archana

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes