

234+109

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

**\*\*\*\***

**CM No.16374-CII of 2019 in/and  
COCP No.443 of 2019  
Date of Decision: 12.09.2019**

Gurmukh Singh

Petitioner

*Versus*

Baldev Singh Sran, Secretary, PSPCL, Patiala and others

Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ravi Gakhar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Rana, Advocate for  
Mr. Vinod S. Bhardwaj, Advocate  
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Khushkaran Kumar, Advocate for  
Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate  
for the respondent No.3.

**\*\*\*\***

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

**CM No.16374-CII of 2019**

The present application has been filed under Section 151  
of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for placing on record reply by  
way of affidavit on behalf of respondents.

The application is allowed, reply is taken on record.

**COCP No.443 of 2019**

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading  
wilful disobedience of order dated 24.04.2018 passed by this Court  
in 18107 of 2014.

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

*“Keeping in view the above, the present petition is allowed. The respondents are directed to regularize the services of the petitioner as T. Mate and further promote him as Assistant Line Man from the date when the services of similarly situated person Sardara Singh were regularized and was promoted as Assistant Line Man along with all consequential benefits within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.”*

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that service of the petitioner has been regularized, given promotion as Assistant Lineman and monetary benefits have also been given from the date when similarly situated employee namely Sardara Singh was regularized and promoted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that directions of this Court have been complied with but the subsequent promotion as Lineman has not been given from the date when similarly situated employee was promoted. He seeks liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.

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

The rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]  
JUDGE**

**September 12, 2019**

*pankaj baweja*

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