

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COC-2376-2020

Date of Decision: 11.11.2020

Vijender Kumar and others

...Petitioners

vs.

Alok Nigam and another

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia.

Present: Mr. Ravi Pratap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

1. Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to the outbreak of pandemic Covid-19.
2. Prayer in the petition under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, is for initiating action against the respondents for violating order Annexure P/1 dated 06.12.2017, in CWP No.27743-2017.
3. Learned counsel contends that vide order Annexure P/1 dated 06.12.2017, in CWP No.27743-2017 of 2020, while issuing notice of motion, operation of letter dated 24/27.11.2017, was stayed and the respondents were directed to ensure that salaries were paid to the petitioners by 7th of each month and that arrears were cleared by 30th of December, 2017 but the salary of the petitioners has not been released in accordance with order dated 06.12.2017.
4. Learned DAG, Haryana, has filed reply and states that the salary of the petitioners upto 31.10.2020, has been released and that in future during

petitioners by 7th of each month would be scrupulously complied with.

5. The same satisfies learned counsel for the petitioners, who states that in view of the assurance held out by the respondents through learned State Counsel, he does not press the contempt petition at this stage and the same may be disposed of as such, while granting liberty to the petitioners to move an application for revival of the contempt petition, if the circumstances of the case, so warrant.

6. In view of the statement of learned counsel for the parties, the Contempt Petition is ***disposed of*** as not calling for any further orders. However, the respondents are directed to abide by their assurance to comply with order dated 06.12.2017 to pay salary of the petitioners by the 7th of each month. It is further made clear that if the respondents fail to adhere to the assurance, the petitioners would be at liberty to move an application for revival of the contempt petition.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

11.11.2020

'PS-Rajesh'

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