

\$~20

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 707/2016 & CM. NO. 36285/2016**

AJAY PAL SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kedar Yadav and Mr. Harkaran
Singh, Advs.

versus

RAJIV MEHRISHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

%

08.08.2019

This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of order dated November 11, 2014 in W.P.(C) 3530/2013. While disposing of the writ petition the Division Bench of this court has stated as under:

“In the aforesaid circumstances, we direct the respondents to pay interest @ 12% per annum on the said amount of disability pension w.e.f 15.03.1978 to 30.06.2013 within a period two months from the date of this order. We also direct the respondents to release the enhanced amount of pension after revision w.e.f 01.7.2013 within the said period of two months, failing which the respondents shall be liable to pay interest @ 12% per annum on the said increased amount on revision.”

From the above it is clear that the respondents were to pay interest on

the disability pension paid for the period March 15, 1978 to June 30, 2013. That apart, respondents were to release enhanced amount of pension after revision w.e.f. July 1, 2013 with 12% interest. It is conceded that an amount of Rs.2,15,754/- which includes the medical allowance has been paid.

Mr. Kirtiman Singh, learned CGSC appearing for the petitioner has stated that over payment of Rs.53,508/-, as enhanced disability pension for the period 1978 to 2004 stood paid to the petitioner inadvertently. The said period was also included while computing the amount of Rs.2,15,754/-. According to him, the interest component on the enhanced disability pension for the period 1978 to 2013 is Rs.1,60,514/-. Out of this, an amount of Rs.53,508/- (over-paid amount) and interest on the said amount of Rs.51,061/- have been deducted and an amount of Rs.55,945/- has been credited in the account of the petitioner. In substance, it is his submission that the order of this court has been complied with. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the calculation given by the respondents in their affidavit of compliance filed on October 13, 2017. If that be so, I am of the view that the order has been complied with.

The contempt is closed.

CM. NO. 36285/2016

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

AUGUST 08, 2019/jg