

205

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

**COCP No.2515 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 01.07.2019**

Mamta and others

Petitioners

Versus

Smt. Asha Kadian, Vice Chancellor, B.P.S. Mahila Vishwavidyalaya,
Sonapat and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. R.K. Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sandeep Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Tribhuvan Dahiya, Advocate
for the respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading that order dated 04.10.2013 passed by this Court in CWP No.2372 of 2011 has intentionally been disobeyed. The operational part of the order is reproduced as under:-

“In view of the above, this petition is allowed. The order annexure P-7 prescribing Rs.300/- per hour subject to maximum of Rs.15000/- qua the petitioners is declared to be illegal, unreasonable and discriminatory. A direction is issued to the respondents to grant the

petitioners remuneration at the rate of Rs.1000/- per lecture subject to a maximum of Rs.25000/- per month w.e.f. the date of their appointment without prejudice to other legal rights of the petitioners or the respondents. The petitioners will be paid the arrears within a period of three months by respondent No.1 University with liberty to claim the additional burden from any of the State authorities liable to provide financial assistance/ grant.”

Learned counsel for the respondents has filed an affidavit alongwith Annexure R-5 stating that order has been complied with and requisite payments have been made to the petitioners, same is taken on record. Copy of the same has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners have moved a representation dated 17.05.2019 raising grievance that the amount calculated by the respondents is not in accordance with the order dated 04.10.2013 passed by the High Court.

There is factual dispute being raised with regard to calculation of the amount.

Learned counsel for the respondents fairly submits that representation would be decided in accordance with law after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents, the petitioners shall appear before respondent No.2 on

05.08.2019 for decision of the representation.

No further interference is called for in the contempt petition. The rule issued against respondent is discharged. There is no doubt that the respondents shall decide the representation filed by the petitioners, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

July 01, 2019
pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes |