

[107] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.44 of 2020
Date of Decision :02.06.2022

Manjit Kaur d/o Late S. Ram Singh and others ...Petitioners

versus

Dr. Manjit Singh Nijjar, Registrar, Punjabi
University, PatialaRespondent

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

Present : Mr. Mukesh Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate with Mr. Akash Soni &
Ms. Preeti Grover, Advocates
for the respondent.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 11.04.2019, in CWP No.9745 of 2019 in case titled as '**Manjit Kaur and others** versus **Punjabi University, Patiala through its Registrar**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that CWP No.9745 of 2019, was disposed of by directing the respondent-University to decide legal notice dated 25.08.2018 served by the petitioners by passing a speaking order within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case, it was found that the petitioners were entitled to any monetary benefit, to release the same to them within three months thereafter.

[3] Learned counsel for the respondent states in compliance of order Annexure P-1, dated 11.04.2019 in CWP No.9745 of 2019, legal notice dated 25.08.2018 was decided by the respondent by passing a speaking order (Annexure R-1) and as per the same, the petitioners have

been held entitled to certain financial benefits, which have been released

to them vide (Annexure R-2), whereas recasting of seniority is subject to the outcome of CWP No.13265 of 2015 in case titled as '**Sewa Singh and others**versus**Punjabi University, Patiala**' and CWP No.26261 of 2015 in case titled as '**Sunita Kumari and others**versus**Punjabi University, Patiala.**'

[4] Learned counsel for the petitioners states that although arrears have been paid to the petitioners vide Annexure R-2, yet the same are not as per entitlement, therefore, the petitioners may be permitted to withdraw the instant petition with liberty to challenge the denial of payment of financial benefits as per entitlement by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law, as also to move an application for revival of the instant petition, if the circumstances of the case so warrant on decisions of '**Sewa Singh's**and '**Sunita Kumari's** cases.

[5] The same is not opposed to by learned counsel for the respondent.

[6] Accordingly, in view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to the petitioners as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

02.06.2022

'Rajneesh'

Whether speaking/ reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No