

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

**COCF No.2864 of 2018
Date of Decision: 11.07.2019**

Chand Rani

Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar, IAS, Secretary, Department of School Education,
Government of Punjab and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 16.02.2017 passed by this Court in CWP No.273 of 2014. Operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“In these circumstances, all the abovenoted 162 writ petitions are disposed of with directions to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioners in the light of the judgments of this Court in A.P. Sharma's and Karanvir Singh's cases (supra) and if it is found that the petitioners are covered by the said judgments, then extend the similar benefits to the petitioners also in those petitions and in case, it is found that they are not covered by the said judgments, then pass a speaking order, denying the said benefits. The needful be done within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this judgment. If it is found that the petitioners are entitled to the arrears, the same shall also be released within two

months from the date of passing of speaking order alongwith with interest, as per the Government instructions.

However, the government can wait for the decision of the SLP filed against A.P. Sharma's case(supra) or against Karanvir Singh's case (supra) and take a final decision after the decision of the SLPs. If the SLPs are dismissed, the directions contained in this order shall be complied with within two months of the dismissal of the SLPs and if SLPs are allowed, then subject to the decision of the SLPs.”

Learned counsel for the respondents has filed reply stating that pension has been re-fixed and monetary benefits have duly been paid.

None has put in appearance for the petitioner inspite of two pass-overs.

In view of the reply filed, no further interference is called for in the contempt petition.

The contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

The rule issued against the respondent is discharged.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

July 11, 2019

<i>pankaj baweja</i>	1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
	2. Whether reportable	:	No