

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

[1] COCP No.3466 of 2018
Date of Decision : 01.09.2022

Suresh Kumar son of Shri Amar Singh and anotherPetitioners

versus

Jyoti Arora, IAS, Addl. Chief Secretary, Higher
Education Department , Haryana, Chandigarh
and anotherRespondents

[2] COCP No.3467 of 2018

Gajraj Singh son of Shri Ram Avtar and othersPetitioners

Versus

Jyoti Arora, IAS, Addl. Chief Secretary, Higher
Education Department , Haryana, Chandigarh
and anotherRespondents

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

Present : Mr. RakeshSobti, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Manish Dadwal, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] This order shall decide COCP No.3466 of 2018 and COCP
No.3467 of 2018 as identical point is in issue in both cases. Facts of the
case are being taken from COCP No.3466 of 2018.

[2] Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against
the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure
P-1, dated 01.06.2016, in CWP No.11431 of 2016 in case titled as
'Suresh Kumar and another versus State of Haryana and another'.

[3] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that CWP

No.11431 of 2016, was disposed of by directing the respondents to consider and decide the case of the petitioners in view of the decision in 'Anurag Chahal and others versus State of Haryana and another', CWP No.16954 of 2015, decided on 05.05.2016, while making it clear that the contractual employees would work to the satisfaction of the respondents and in case the posts were abolished or their work and conduct was not satisfactory, their services could be dispensed with by the respondents.

[3] At the outset, learned counsel contends that the benefit of minimum of pay scale as was sought in terms of decision in 'Anurag Chahal and others's case (*supra*) has been granted to the petitioners by the respondents vide order dated 06.02.2019, therefore, the petitioners do not press the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same.

[4] 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 respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[5] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

01.09.2022
'Rajneesh'

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