

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

COCN No.46 of 2020
Date of Decision :02.06.2022

Gurdeep Kaur d/o Late S. Pritam Singh
and others ...Petitioners

versus

Dr. Manjit Singh Nijjar, Registrar,
Punjabi University, Patiala.Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Mukesh Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate 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 26.04.2019, in CWP No.10843 of 2019 in case titled as '**Gurdeep Kaur and others**versus**Punjabi University, Patiala**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that CWP No.10843 of 2019, was disposed of by directing the respondent-University to decide legal notice dated 19.10.2018 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 that in compliance of order P-1, dated 26.04.2019 in CWP No.10843 of 2019, legal notice dated 19.10.2018 was decided by the respondent by passing a speaking order and as per the same, the petitioners have been held entitled to certain financial benefits, which have been released to them, 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, 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**'sand '**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