

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 430 of 2016
Date of decision: 24.7.2019

Ravinder Sharma and others

.. Petitioners

v.

Parmod Kumar Saha and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Ms. Anita Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Arun Gosain, Advocate for respondent No. 1.

...

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 11.2.2015 passed by this Court in CWP No. 6413 of 2013. The operative part of the said order is reproduced below:

“There is no representation for the Union to defend the restriction of the scholarship to only degree courses and not availing it to diploma course which merges into a bachelor's course of engineering. There ought to be a basis for any justification of why a denial is made to a particular class of persons who joined the stream of a bachelor's course. I find no justification at all for the scheme that makes ineligible the students studying in various diploma courses without minding the effect of situations of persons who merged in a bachelor's degree course. I find that there is no concealment of any issue

relating to the fact that they were at the time of admission to the course taking admission only to a diploma course which after the completion of two years as persons who fell within the first 50% in the order of merit were absorbed into the bachelor's degree of Engineering Course and completed the course as well. The denial of scholarship cannot be supported and I quash the order and direct the entire scholarship that has accrued for each one of the years to be released within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order.”

In compliance of the said order, learned counsel for respondent No. 1 has produced the sanction letter. Copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. He states that payment for scholarship has also been made.

In the absence of any instructions, learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to rebut the same.

In view of the above, the present contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous. However, in any case any discrepancy is found in the statement made by learned counsel for respondent No. 1, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

24.7.2019
mk

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