

226 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No.935 of 2018 (O&M)
Decided on: August 19, 2019

Sushila Devi Chauhan and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Jitender Kumar Bhardwaj

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr.Kannan Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr.B.L.Gupta, Advocate for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

This contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of the order dated 19.1.2016 passed by this Court in CWP No.1204 of 2005.

The petition was allowed in view of the judgment of this Court in *CWP No.13946 of 2004 titled as Dr.Anil Khurana and others Versus Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak and others*. In LPA No.2104 of 2013, the respondents were directed to grant the necessary relief to the petitioners within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

The respondent has filed the reply stating that the necessary relief has been granted and payments have been made to the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the amount

granted has not been calculated correctly and only minimum pay scale has been allowed but allowances have not been considered. He further states that no payment has been made for the vacation period. His grievance is that similar relief has been granted to the other similarly situated persons.

Learned counsel for the respondent states that the relief due was granted.

In view of the fact that the payments have been made to the petitioners, the issue with regard to the correct calculation of the amount paid is a disputed question of fact and cannot be gone into in the present contempt petition.

In view of the above, the present contempt petition is disposed of. However, the petitioners will be at liberty to avail the remedy available in accordance with law including moving a detailed representation to the respondent within two weeks from today. In case such representation is made, the respondent will decide the same in accordance with law after providing opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

The needful shall be done expeditiously but not later than three months from the receipt of the representation.

Rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

August 19, 2019
Meenu

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable :</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>