

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

124

COCF No.2579 of 2018

Date of Decision: August 27th, 2018

Dr. M.L. Asar

...Petitioner

Versus

Dr. Ashwani Kumar Sharma and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI

Present: Mr. B.P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has approached this Court alleging violation of the order dated 25.03.2015 passed by this Court in Review Application No.393 of 2014 in CWP No.3001 of 1992, whereby the directions were issued to the College to assign a Guide to the petitioner for whatever work he had done and he may resubmit the thesis with the certification of the newly assigned Guide. The rules were also relaxed keeping in view the fact that the case has been pending with this Court for a long time. The Guide to be assigned to the petitioner will perform the duties as are expected of him and to take it from the stage when the thesis would require such further guidance and forward the same to the University. No time limit was fixed for the said purpose.

2. It is the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that the order passed by this Court has not been complied with as he has received a communication dated 22.11.2016 from the Principal, Government Ayurvedic College, Patiala, according to which in compliance with the order passed by this Court, the Director, Research and Medical Education, Mohali, had instructed to file the case and directed to inform the

same. Petitioner had been able to get the reasons for rejection of his claim

with great difficulty. He, thus, contends that the order as passed by this Court has not been complied with as the reason assigned for not proceeding further with the matter of the petitioner, is the passing of the PNDT Act, 1994, which has come into effect at a subsequent stage and not at the stage when the petitioner had completed his research work and as a matter of fact, submitted his thesis in the year 1992.

3. He, thus, contends that the action of the respondents is violative of the order dated 25.03.2015 passed by this Court.

4. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and with his assistance, have gone through the records of the case.

5. The plea, as has been put forth by learned counsel for the petitioner, may hold some weight as regards the merit for rejection of the claim of the petitioner is concerned but that would not amount to contempt of Court in the consideration of this Court.

6. The present contempt petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

August 27th, 2018
Puneet

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No