

234

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

**CM No.9409-CII of 2019
COCP No.2048 of 2018
Date of Decision: 16.09.2019**

Sukhpal Singh and others

Petitioners

Versus

Parmod Kumar, District Food and Supplies Controller, Fatehabad
and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Ashok Goel, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

CM No.9409-CII of 2019

The present application has been filed under Section 151
of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for placing on record the affidavit
of Parmod Kumar, District Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer
Affairs Controller, Fatehabad.

Application is allowed, affidavit is taken on record.

CM stands disposed of.

Main Case

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 04.08.2016 passed by this Court in CWP No.15637 of 2016.

A writ petition was filed by the petitioners being aggrieved that the petitioners being contractual employees were being replaced by another set of contractual employees. Notice of motion was issued. Meantime, it was ordered that petitioners shall not be relieved if they are working as on 30.07.2016.

The petitioners filed a contempt petition bearing COCP No.2370 of 2016, same was disposed of on 18.10.2016 on the statement made by respondent No.2 that petitioners' services are continuing and they will be paid salary from the month of September within a period of one week and thereafter will be paid continuously till the interim order subsists or till the decision of the writ petition.

The present contempt petition has been filed being aggrieved of fresh tender floated by the respondent for outsourcing agency.

Pursuant to notice of motion, learned counsel for respondent No.1 states that petitioners are regularly paid salaries and would be paid till modification of the interim order dated 04.08.2016 or disposal of CWP No.15637 of 2016. He states that they are being paid as per earlier terms and conditions.

In view of statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner states that no cause of action survives for pursuing the

contempt petition.

The contempt petition is disposed of.

The rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

September 16, 2019

pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |