

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

COCP No. 2582 of 2017

Date of Decision: 24.09.2019

Rajpati

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sh. P.K. Dass and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. S.S. Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. DAG Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

The petitioner filed writ petition for quashing of order dated 27.3.2015, rejecting the claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment. The writ petition was disposed of. The benefit for compassionate appointment was not given. However, one opportunity was granted to the petitioner to exercise the option under Haryana Compassionate Assistance to the Dependents of Deceased Government Employees Rules, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as '2006 Rules') and thereafter respondents were directed to release the benefit within two months after the exercise of the option. In case the payment was not made within time, the petitioner was held entitled to 8% interest per annum.

The present contempt petition was filed alleging that needful has not been done by the respondents. Affidavits and replies have been filed in the contempt proceedings. The counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that monthly assistance has been allowed and is being paid to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter-alia* raises grievance with regard to fixation of pay and that interest has not been correctly calculated.

The contention now being raised cannot be gone into in the present contempt petition as the said contention would require fresh pleadings and even adducing of evidence. Moreover, the directions of this Court have been complied with that the benefit be granted under 2006 Rules.

The contempt petition is disposed of, however, the petitioner shall be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law for redressal of grievance still left.

24.09.2019

reema

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No