

Manjit Singh Bahra

...Petitioner

Versus

Sarvjit Singh and others

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Nipun Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Aditya Sharda, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

[1] Learned counsel contends that CWP No.5956 of 2015 was allowed vide order dated 10.01.2017, by holding the petitioner entitled to payment of interest @ 9 per cent per annum on arrears with interest being payable w.e.f. date of filing of the writ petition till date of payment and on failure of the respondents to do the needful, the petitioner invoked the jurisdiction of this Court by way of COCP No.34 of 2019, which was disposed of vide order dated 22.10.2019 by granting liberty to the petitioner to file a representation with regard to claim for difference of retiral benefits as also regarding calculation of interest with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation within four weeks after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and to make payment of the amount if any found due within four weeks thereafter.

[2] Learned counsel contends that the instant petition was filed on account of failure of the respondents to comply with order dated 22.10.2019 in COCP No.34 of 2019 but after the filing of the instant petition, the respondents have accepted the claim of the petitioner and

Annexure P-1 dated 10.01.2017 in CWP No.5956 of 2015, as well as COCP No. 34 of 2019, therefore, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition and the same may be disposed of, as such.

[4] Learned State Counsel also states that the claim of the petitioner having been accepted and payment released to him as per his entitlement, the contempt petition may be disposed of as not calling for any orders against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[5] I have considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties.

[6] Admittedly, orders of the Writ Court dated 10.01.2017 in CWP No.5956 of 2015 and 22.10.2019 in COCP No. 34 of 2019 have been complied with and payment as per entitlement released to the petitioner, therefore, there being compliance, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondents. Accordingly, the instant petition is *disposed of as such*.

[7] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

11.10.2021
'Rajneesh'

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