

230(7 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1.	COCP-2142-2018 Date of Decision: February 13, 2019	
Jasbir Singh	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent
2.	COCP-2143-2018	
Gurkamal Singh	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent
3.	COCP-2144-2018	
Shamsher Singh	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent
4.	COCP-2145-2018	
Hakam Singh	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent
5.	COCP-2146-2018	
Harminder Singh Saini	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent
6.	COCP-2147-2018	
Amrik Pal Singh Dhillon	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent
7.	COCP-2148-2018	
Raghbir Chand Sharma	Versus	Petitioner
Jaspal Singh		Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR

Present: Mr.Rujhan Dhawan, Advocate for
Mr.Karan Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Kanisth Ganeriwala, AAG, Punjab.

.....

NIRMALJIT KAUR, J. (ORAL)

This order shall dispose of the above captioned contempt petitions as the point in issue involved in all the cases is common in nature. For the sake of convenience the facts are being extracted from COCP-2142-2018.

The contempt petition is filed for non-compliance of the order dated 01.03.2018 vide which a direction was issued to look into the grievance unfolded by the petitioner in the representation dated 05.01.2018 and to decide the same in view of the policy/Circular dated 14.03.2017 seeking removal of anomaly in the pay and allowances.

Separate replies filed in all the cases except in COCP-2143-2018 are taken on record. Learned counsel for the respondent states that the reply filed in other contempt petitions be adopted in COCP-2143-2018 as well.

As per the said replies, the order has been complied with. The claim of the petitioners was considered by the Government and speaking orders have been passed which has been placed on record as Annexure R1. Hence, the order stands complied with.

In view of the same, no useful purpose would be served in continuing with the contempt petitions. The same are hereby dismissed.

The rule issued against the respondent(s) stands discharged.

However, in case the petitioners are aggrieved by the said order, i.e. Annexure R1 in any manner, they are at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners had submitted that the cases may be adjourned but this Court finds no reason to do so, as admittedly on similar ground, COCP No.2449 of 2018 in CWP No.4832 of 2018 has already been dismissed with liberty as granted to the petitioners herein.

February 13, 2019
meenuss

(NIRMALJIT KAUR)
JUDGE

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