

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

COCN No. 3481 of 2019

DECIDED ON: NOVEMBER 26, 2019

RAM SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

SH. SUNIL SARAN

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Ram Pal Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The petitioner filed a writ petition seeking direction to the respondents to grant deemed date of appointment as has been given to other candidates in pursuance of the selection list dated 15.10.1989 by Haryana Staff Selection Commission. Further prayer was to grant the benefit of seniority and notional pay fixation at par with the candidates/employees who have joined their services prior to the petitioner but were junior. The petition was disposed of on 04.09.2018 directing the respondents to take a conscious decision on the representation of the petitioner. The needful was to be done within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

The petitioner filed a present contempt petition under Section 10 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 pleading that the needful was not done.

Pursuant to notice of motion, learned State counsel filed reply by

way of an affidavit of Mr. Sunil Saran, Director, Treasuries and Accounts

Department, Haryana annexing the order dated 20.11.2019, same is taken on record, copy handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Mr. Vijay Kumar, Joint Director, Treasuries and Accounts, Haryana, submits that the seniority of the petitioner has been fixed and he has been placed at Sr. No. 206-E. On instructions, he further submits that the claim of the petitioner with regard to promotion and financial upgradation at par with his juniors is rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent has erred in rejecting the claim of petitioner for notional promotion and financial upgradation.

The said aspect cannot be gone into in the contempt proceedings, as the direction of this Court was only take decision on the representation. The said direction has been substantially complied with. No further interference is called for.

In view of above, the present petition is disposed of.

The Rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

Needless to say that petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law against the order dated 20.11.2019 attached with the reply.

NOVEMBER 26, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether reportable *Yes/No*