

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

	1.	COCP No.1523 of 2018
Kashmiri Lal		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	2.	COCP No.1524 of 2018
Ran Singh		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	3.	COCP No.1525 of 2018
Satish Kumar		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	4.	COCP No.1526 of 2018
Jagdish		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	5.	COCP No.1527 of 2018
Ram Chand		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	6.	COCP No.1528 of 2018
Bahadur Chand		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	7.	COCP No.1529 of 2018
Om Parkash		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	8.	COCP No.1530 of 2018
Ram Kumar		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	9.	COCP No.1531 of 2018
Krishna		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents

	10.	COCP No.1532 of 2018
Sahi Ram		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	11.	COCP No.1533 of 2018
Chander Kalan and others		... Petitioners
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	12.	COCP No.1534 of 2018
Onkar Chand		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	13.	COCP No.1535 of 2018
Rameshwar		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	14.	COCP No.1536 of 2018
Shanta Rani and another		... Petitioners
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	15.	COCP No.1537 of 2018
Shyakori Devi		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	16.	COCP No.1538 of 2018
Ram Niwas		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	17.	COCP No.1539 of 2018
Sant Lal		... Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents
	18.	COCP No.1540 of 2018
Shanker Lal (since deceased) through his LRs		... Petitioners
	Vs.	
Shri Rajesh Jindal and another		... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR

Present : Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

NIRMALJIT KAUR, J. (Oral)

All the aforementioned contempt petitions are being disposed of by this common order being identical.

All the contempt petitions have been filed for disobedience of the order dated 07.09.2017 passed in CWP No.20273 of 2017 and connected writ petitions vide which the writ petitions were disposed of on the statement made by the learned counsel for the State on having instructions from the Chief Controller Finance, HUDA, Panchkula that after necessary formalities to disburse the amount are completed, the requisite amount shall be released to the petitioner (s) within four weeks from today.

No one was present on behalf of the petitioner (s) on 6.12.2018. However, on the statement of the learned counsel for the respondents-State that there was no dispute with respect to the entitlement of the petitioners relating to annuity, the matter was adjourned to enable the respondents-State to release the amount to the petitioner (s).

Today, a request for adjournment has been made on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner (s).

However, in view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondents-State on instructions from Shri Ashok Kumar Patwari that the payment towards the annuity has since been deposited in the account of the petitioner (s), this Court does not find any reason to adjourn the matter any further.

In view of the fact that amount has been deposited in the

account of the petitioner (s), contempt petitions are dismissed. Rule is discharged. However, if there is any discrepancy in the amount relating to annuity so deposited in the account of the petitioner (s), the petitioner (s) are at liberty to file representation within two weeks from today bringing out their grievances which shall be considered and decided by the competent authority within four weeks from the date of said representation.

The next question is with respect to the interest part which still remains. The petitioner (s) vide order dated 7.9.2017 were given liberty to represent the respondents as regards the interest on delayed payment of their claims.

Learned counsel for the respondents-State on instructions submits that no representation has been made till date. However, there appears to be a vague reference to the same in the legal notice dated 24.4.2018 by the petitioner (s). Accordingly, the respondents shall now consider the said legal notice as representation for the payment of interest and take a final decision with respect to the same within four weeks from today. In case, the petitioner (s) are found entitled to the amount of interest, the same shall be paid to the petitioner (s) by another four weeks of the said decision on the said representation or else pass a speaking order for which the petitioner (s) will be at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

(NIRMALJIT KAUR)
JUDGE

31.01.2019
rajeev

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether reportable **Yes/No**