

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.2567 of 2018
Date of decision: 1.7.2019

Chander Kanta Verma

.. Petitioner

v.

Dhira Khandelwal, IAS and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

...

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The contempt petition has been filed that the order dated 14.2.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No. 4741 of 2015 is being willfully disobeyed by the respondents.

The writ petition was allowed. The operative part of the order dated 14.2.2018 is reproduced below:

“27. I find sufficient justification in the special facts of this case to bring relief to the petitioner on just and equitable grounds by setting aside the impugned orders dated July 24, 2006 (P-15) and July 23, 2014 (P-21), the latter passed during the pendency of the petition on the directions of this Court to pass an order in CWP No. 5055 of 2007 previously filed by her.

28. As a result of the above discussion, the writ petition is

allowed with consequential benefits. The petitioner is held entitled to declaration of regularization. The respondents are directed to pass a fresh order in the light of the present judgment. The regularization would be from the due date by according relaxation and ignoring the shortfall in the percentage of 2% in the MA degree. The statutes of the University of Rajasthan at Jaipur at the relevant time from where the petitioner read for, treat 48% marks in Master of Arts degree as qualifying the examination in the second division.”

Learned counsel for the State submits that regularization order of the petitioner has been passed and certain amount for GPF and leave encashment has already been paid.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from Mr. Vijay Kumar, Principal, Education Department, GSSS, Bharo Khan, Sirsa states that with regard to the retiral benefits, the matter is in process in the office of Accountant General, Haryana and the same would be paid to the petitioner within six weeks from today.

In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the State, the present contempt petition is disposed of. In case the abovesaid statement is not complied with, the petitioner shall be at liberty to revive the present petition for which the respondents will be responsible.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

1.7.2019
mk

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No