

256

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.2275 of 2019
Date of decision: 02.09.2019

Rajesh Kumar and others

.. Petitioners

Versus

B.S.Sran, Chairman (CMD), Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd.

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Gaagan Pradeep Singh Bal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate for
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of the orders dated 17.07.2018 and dated 15.01.2019 passed by this Court in CWP No.27874 of 2017 and COCP No.154 of 2019, respectively. The operative part of the order dated 17.07.2018 is reproduced below:

“Accordingly, in view of the above, the petitions are hereby disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioners in the light of Annexure P-7 within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the petitioners is admissible to them, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to them, within a period of eight weeks thereafter. However, in case the

competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioners is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matters."

A bunch of petitions were disposed of vide order dated 17.07.2018 with direction to consider the case of the petitioners in the light of judgment of this Court in CWP No.4458 of 2011 titled as **Kulwant Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others**, decided on 11.03.2011. Needful was required to be done within eight weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

Today, reply by way of an affidavit dated 30.08.2019 along with Annexure R-1/2 (order) and Annexure R-1/3 (compliance report dated 24.12.2018) filed in Court, is taken on record. A copy of the same is handed over to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the order dated 24.12.2018, no cause of action survives for pursuing the present contempt petition. However, he seeks liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law against the said order.

In view of the above, the contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous with liberty as prayed for.

Rule issued against the respondents is discharged.

02.09.2019

hemlata

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No