

221

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

**COCF No.2558 of 2018
Date of Decision: 11.09.2019**

Satish Kumar and another

Petitioners

Versus

Sukhjit Pal Singh, D.P.I., Secondary Education, Punjab

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 23.02.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.4413 of 2018.

The relevant portion of the order is reproduced below:-

“In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Director Public Instruction, Secondary Education, Vidya Bhawan (Punjab School Education Board), Block-E, 4th Floor, Phase-8, SAS Nagar Mohali to consider and decide the representations dated 18.12.2017 and 20.12.2017 (Annexures P-12 and P-13) within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the

conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.”

Reply by way of affidavit of Sukhjeet Pal Singh, DPI (Secondary Education), Punjab annexing order dated 31.07.2019 has been filed today in the Court, same is taken on record. Copy of reply is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. In the reply, it is stated that claim of the petitioner has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of reply filed, states that no cause of action survives for pursuing the contempt petition. However, he seeks liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law against the order dated 31.07.2019.

The contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous, with liberty as prayed for.

The rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

September 11, 2019

pankaj baweja

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