

233

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

\*\*\*\*

COCF No.162 of 2019

Date of Decision: 09.09.2019

Darshan Singh and others

Petitioners

Versus

Karan Avtar Singh, Chief Secretary, Punjab and others

Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present: Mr. B.S. Patwalia, Advocate for  
Mr. Pankaj Jain, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanish Ganeriwala, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):**

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of orders of this Court. The writ petition filed by the petitioners was allowed in view of decision of this Court in LPA No.108 of 2012 titled as ***State of Punjab and another Vs. Rupinder Pal and others*** decided on 08.11.2012. LPA was allowed in view of decision of this Court in ***Parveen Kumar and another Vs. State of Punjab and others (CWP No.20501 of 2008)***. It was held that petitioner shall be granted benefit of pension under Pension Rules dated 16.01.2002.

Reply has been filed today in the Court, same is taken on record. Copy of reply is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioners.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Mr. Rajneesh Goyal, Law Officer, Department of Higher Education, Punjab states that respondents have preferred SLP but the same has not been listed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that though SLP has been preferred but decision of this Court has not been stayed.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions, submits that in case decision of this Court is not stayed or modified, the same would be implemented within four weeks from today subject to outcome of SLP.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and statement made today in the Court, the contempt petition is disposed of.

The respondents shall adhere to the undertaking given in the Court today. In case no stay is granted or order is not modified, the benefits shall be granted to the petitioners subject to outcome of the litigation.

In case statement made today in the Court is not adhered to, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]**  
**JUDGE**

**September 09, 2019**

*pankaj baweja*

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