

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 715 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.09.2019

Rakesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Paramjit Singh and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. P.K. Goklnaey, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sehaj Bir Singh, Advocate
for respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

C.M. No. 18132-CII of 2019

Application is allowed.

Reply along with Annexures R1 and R2 are taken on record
subject to all just exceptions.

COCP No. 715 of 2018

This contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful
disobedience of order dated 26.10.2017 passed in CWP No. 24234 of 2017.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:

"7. Accordingly, all these petitions are disposed of with the direction to the respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner(s) in their respective legal notice(s), if no legal notice is issued, in that eventuality, the writ petition(s) be considered as representation and to take conscious decision in accordance with service rules as well as circular dated 23.04.1990 and in the light of various judgments passed in CWP

*No.10808 of 2007, CWP No. 7538 of 2014 and letter dated 11.05.2015, within a period of two months, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, relief shall stand restricted to 38 months in view of **Tarsem Singh's** case and **Saroj Kumari's case (supra)**.*

*8. The claim with regard to interest on delayed payment shall also be considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as “**R.S. Randhawa v. State of Punjab**”, 1997 (3) RSJ 318.*

9. However, if the petitioner(s) still feels aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, they shall be at liberty to approach this Court."

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the reply filed and orders annexed, no cause of action survives for pursuing the present contempt petition, however, he seeks liberty to avail remedy against the orders annexed with the reply whereby the claim has been rejected.

Disposed of as infructuous with liberty as prayed for.

The rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

10.09.2019
reema

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No