

236

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

**COCP No.1100 of 2019
Date of Decision: 17.07.2019**

Krishan Chand and others

Petitioners

Versus

Poonamdip Kaur, Managing Director, Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Nabha Road, Patiala

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Gurjeet Brar, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Aggarwal, Advocate for
Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 12.10.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.9200 of 2018.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of with direction to the respondents to pay the amount on account of interest of delayed payment at the rate of 9% per annum from the due date till the date of payment within a period of three months.”

The respondent has filed the reply by way of affidavit of Arvind Gupta, Legal Advisor, Pepsu Road Transport Corporation,

Patiala, same is taken on record. Copy of reply is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. It has been stated that interest on Gratuity, Leave Encashment and General Provident Fund has been calculated. Interest calculated on General Provident Fund has been given to the petitioners through cheques and interest on Gratuity and Leave Encashment has been transferred to Depot concerned for depositing the same in the savings bank accounts of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the respondent states that interest shall be transferred to the petitioners within two weeks from today.

In view of reply filed and statement made by learned counsel for the respondent, learned counsel for the petitioners states that no cause of action survives for pursuing the contempt petition.

The contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

The petitioners would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law, if some grievance still survives.

The rule issued against the respondent is discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

July 17, 2019

pankaj baweja

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