

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No. 116 of 2019

Date of Decision: 09.07.2019

Ram Nath

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sh. J. Ganeshan

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Rajesh K. Kataria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Padamkant Deweidi, Advocate
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

This contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful
disobeyance of order dated 25.9.2017 passed in CWP No. 21831 of 2017.

The operational part 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 his representation dated 08.08.2017 (Annexure P-20) and to decide the same as per Rules and Regulations as well as in the light of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No.3792 of 2012, titled as **"Suresh Chand and others v. State of Haryana and others"**, decided on 14.01.2016 (Annexure P-13), LPA No.1805 of 2016, titled as **"Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board and another v. Prem Parkash Gupta and others"** decided on 05.10.2016 (Annexure P-14) and judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in case, captioned as **"Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board and Another vs. Suresh Chand and others"** (Annexure P-15), which as per the version of learned counsel for the petitioner, attained finality; within a period of three 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.

4. As far as grant of interest on delayed payment is concerned that shall also be considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as “R.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab, 1997 (3)RSJ 318.

7. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved of the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.”

Learned counsel for the respondent states that an order dated 8.7.2019 has been passed by the Chief Administrator. Copy of the order produced today in Court and the same is taken on record. Copy of order has been supplied to counsel for the petitioner.

In view of the order passed, no interference is required in the contempt proceedings.

While disposing of the writ petition, liberty to avail remedy has already been granted to the petitioner.

The contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

09.07.2019
reema

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No