

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

Gurpreet Kaur
2018.02.12 16:23
Attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
high court

COCP No.302 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.02.2018

Pardeep Agarwal

....Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Manvendra Pratap Singh

....Respondent

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Thakan, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Bhushan Bhatia, Advocate
for the respondent.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

C.M. No.20249-CII of 2017

This application has been moved for placing on record
Annexures P-2 to P-4.

C.M is allowed and Annexures P-2 to P-4 are taken on record.

COCP No.302 of 2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that order dated
24.10.2016 has not fully been complied with as only the disciplinary
proceedings have been concluded but the petitioner has not been paid the
subsistence allowance for the intervening period i.e from the date of
dismissal till the conclusion of the disciplinary proceedings, whereas,
learned counsel for the respondent submits that whatever was due to the
petitioner has been paid to him.

On perusal of Annexure R-1, it appears that the petitioner has
been paid the subsistence allowance for the period as directed by this Court.

In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of.

However, in case, the petitioner is still aggrieved in any manner
and if less amount has been paid to him, he is at liberty to move
representation to the competent authority and the respondent is directed to
take action thereupon in accordance with law.

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

07.02.2018

gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No