

COCp-842- 2018

Date of decision: April 6, 2022

Naib Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Amarjeet, Deputy Registrar Cooperative Societies Bathinda PCS-I, Bathinda
and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S. WALIAPresent: Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

B.S. WALIA, J.

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 18.09.2017 in CWP No. 21204 of 2017 in case titled as 'Naib Singh vs. State of Punjab and others'.

[2] A perusal of Annexure P-1 dated 18.09.2017 reveals that CWP No.21204 of 2017 was disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3-Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Bathinda to look into the grievance unfolded by the petitioner in his legal noted dated 15.06.2017 in the light of instructions dated 14.07.1995 and take a conscious decision in respect thereto, within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and also to consider the claim of the petitioner for grant of interest on delayed payment in view of the decision of the Full Bench of this Court in case titled as “***R.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab, 1997(3) RSJ 318***”.

[3] Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that

COC-842- 2018 -2-

claim of the petitioner as contained in legal notice dated 15.06.2017 and have already released retiral benefits to the petitioner in terms of his entitlement but interest remains to be paid on the retiral benefits which has been agreed to be paid by the respondents within one year.

[4] Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in the circumstances the petitioner does not press the instant petition, instead may be granted liberty to move an application for revival of the instant petition in the eventuality of the interest as has been agreed to be paid, is not paid within the stipulated period of time.

[5] Learned Assistant Advocate General states that he has no objection to the proposed course of action.

[6] Accordingly, in view of the position noted above, the instant petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

[7] Rule discharged.

April 6, 2022

Satyawan

**(B.S. WALIA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No