

246

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

**COCP No.3397 of 2018
Date of Decision: 30.09.2019**

Veer Singh

Petitioner

Versus

Bhagwaan Singh Mathaaru, Chief Engineer, WEST, PSPCL,
Bathinda

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Abhinav Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 02.07.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.15237 of 2018.

The relevant portion of the order is reproduced as under:-

“In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3- The Chief Engineer, WEST, Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd., District Bathinda to consider and decide the representation dated 23.03.2018 (Annexure P-4) within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit

claimed by the petitioner is admissible to him, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible to him or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.”

Reply by way of affidavit of Mr. D.S. Toor, Addl. S.E., D.S., City Division, PSPCL, Moga has been filed today in the Court, same is taken on record. Copy of reply is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. It has been mentioned that claim of the petitioner has been accepted and monetary benefits accruing to him have been deposited in his account.

In view of reply filed, learned counsel for the petitioner states that no cause of action survives for pursuing the contempt petition. However, he seeks liberty to avail remedies if aggrieved of calculation of the amount found due.

The contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous with liberty as prayed for.

The rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

September 30, 2019

pankaj baweja

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