

222-A

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

**1. COCP No.2989 of 2018
Date of Decision: 08.07.2019**

Avtar Singh and others

Petitioners

Versus

Faisal Imman (A&E), Accountant General, Punjab and others

Respondents

2. COCP No.2990 of 2018

Daljit Singh and others

Petitioners

Versus

Faisal Imman (A&E), Accountant General, Punjab and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Ms. Meenu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

These two contempt petitions have been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 16.02.2017 passed by this Court in CWP No.273 of 2014 and are being disposed of by a common order. For convenience, facts are being taken from COCP No.2989 of 2018.

Operational part of the order dated 16.02.2017 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.

State went in Special Leave Petition, same was dismissed vide order dated 04.05.2017.

On notice, Learned State counsel has filed reply annexing the order passed in pursuance of the directions of this Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that there is grievance against the order passed by the respondent as there is

subsequent notification whereby claim of the petitioner has wrongly been rejected.

In view of reply filed by the State, the present contempt petition has been rendered infructuous. Rule issued against the respondents is discharged.

The petitioner would be at liberty avail remedies in accordance with law.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

July 08, 2019

pankaj baweja

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