

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No. 1337 of 2019

DECIDED ON: AUGUST 20, 2019

R.M.P. JAISWAL AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

A. SREENIVAS DIRECTOR GENERAL, HIGHER EDUCATION,
HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

This contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience
of order dated 06.09.2018 passed in CWP No. 21590 of 2018.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:

*“ Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to
respondent No.2 to look into the grievances unfolded by the
petitioners in the legal notice dated 31.05.2018 (P-14) and to
take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order in the
light of the judgment referred to above in para no.1 of this
order, within a period of four months from the date of receipt
of a certified copy of this order.*

*In case, petitioners still feel aggrieved by any of the
order(s) passed by the aforesaid authority, they shall be at
liberty to have recourse to the remedies available under law
and/or to approach this Court. ”*

Learned State counsel has filed an affidavit of A.Sreenivas, IAS, Special Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Haryana annexing the order dated 16.08.2019, a copy handed over to counsel for the petitioners. The claim of the petitioners has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the legal notice has not been decided in a proper perspective. He further submits that the petitioners are aggrieved of the rejection of their claim.

The said aspect cannot be gone into the present contempt petition, as the only direction was given to take a conscious decision on the legal notice in the light of the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 19641 of 2009, titled as *R.K. Aggarwal and others vs. State of Haryana and others;* decided on 21.12.2012.

In view of the reply filed, no cause of action survives for pursuing the contempt petition.

Disposed of as infructuous.

Rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

The petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law to challenge the order dated 16.08.2019.

AUGUST 20, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

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