

127

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

**COC P No. 1869 of 2019
Date of Decision: 29.08.2019**

Hari Singh, J.E. (Retired)

Petitioner

Versus

Er. Baldev Singh Sran, Chairman-cum-Managing Director, PSPCL,
Patiala.

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Sehaj Bir Singh, Advocate with
Mr. Varinder Deepak, Executive Engineer,
PSPCL, Sangrur
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 21.05.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No.12951 of 2018.

The relevant portion of the order is reproduced below:-

“3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in legal notice dated 14.03.2018 (Annexure P-4) and to decide the same in view of circular dated 23.04.1990 (Annexure P-1) amended from time to time, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, relief shall stand restricted to 38 months in view of Full Bench judgment of this Court in Saroj Kumari v.

State of Punjab and others”, 1998(3) SCT 664, as there is inordinate delay on the part of the petitioner to approach this Court.

4. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against any of the order(s) passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to the remedies available under law as well as to approach this Court.”

Reply was filed in the Court whereby claim of the petitioner has been accepted. It is stated that due amount has been paid to the petitioner through cheque. The receipt of cheque is produced today in the Court, same is taken on record.

In view of above, no cause of action survives.

None had appeared for the petitioner on the last two dates. Even today none has put in appearance for the petitioner inspite of two pass-overs.

The contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

The petitioner has already been granted liberty by the Writ Court to have recourse to the remedies available under law, if still aggrieved.

The rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

August 29, 2019

pankaj baweja

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