

**204
(8 cases)**

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

COCN No.10 of 2017

Date of Decision: 15.05.2019

Kalyan Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Mohammed Shayin and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR

Present: Mr.Vijay Pal, Advocate,
Mr. Praveen Gupta, Advocate and
Mr.Dalbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana
alongwith Mr. Ravi Pratap, AAG, Haryana

NIRMALJIT KAUR, J. (ORAL)

The present contempt petition alongwith COCN No.11 of 2017, COCN No.12 of 2017, COCN No.1537 of 2017(O&M), COCN No.3441 of 2018 (O&M), COCN No. 3442 of 2018(O&M), COCN No.3592 of 2018(O&M) and COCN No.79 of 2019(O&M) are being disposed of by a common order as the question of law and facts are identical.

The above mentioned contempt petitions are filed for non-compliance of the order dated 05.05.2016 vide which the following directions were given:-

“Applying the ratio of the above mentioned judgments, the writ petition is allowed and petitioners are allowed to continue to work on their post till the regular selections are made and they are entitled to get the salary of the vacation period and remuneration @ Rs. 1000/- per lecture subject to a maximum of Rs. 25000/- per month”.

Reply has been filed. As per the said reply, direction given by

the Court to the extent of not relieving the petitioners is complied with. Further, the petitioners have also been paid as per the order passed by the learned Single Bench from the date of notification i.e. 20.07.2017.

Thus, after hearing learned counsel for the parties, the only dispute that survives is with respect to the payment prior to the date of notification and for the vacation period as per the order passed by the learned Single Bench. Both these issues are admittedly pending before the LPA Bench in LPA Nos.275 of 2017, 306 of 2017 and 1111 of 2018. As per the order passed by the Division Bench on 21.11.2018 in the above mentioned LPAs the Court recorded the submissions of the learned counsel for the State that the State has taken a policy decision which according to them would redress the grievance of the petitioners and satisfy the order of the learned Single Judge in its entirety. Thus, it is evident that the order to the extent as passed in the LPA has already been complied with and LPA qua the remaining dispute, is still pending. It goes without saying that parties will be bound by the order passed by the LPA Bench.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any reason to continue with the above mentioned contempt petitions. Accordingly, the same are dismissed.

Consequently, the pending miscellaneous applications have been rendered infructuous and are disposed as such.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

(NIRMALJIT KAUR)
JUDGE

15.05.2019
rakesh

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No