

COCP No. 167 of 2020

Date of Decision : 21.09.2022

Kewal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

A. Venuprashad, Principal Secretary, Department of Local Bodies,
Punjab, Civil Secretariat, Sector 9, Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Peeush Gagneja, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ayush Sarna, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. Gaurav Deep Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate,
for respondent no. 4.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 08.03.2019, in CWP No. 6237-2019, in case titled as 'Kewal Singh versus The State of Punjab and others.

2. A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CWP No. 6237-2019, was disposed of by directing the respondents to decide legal notice dated 15.01.2019 (Annexure P-4) by passing a speaking order within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

3. Reply dated 26.08.2020 is on the record. Learned counsel

contends that initially speaking order Annexure R-1/1T dated 02.04.2019 was passed by the Joint Deputy Director, Local Government, Ferozepur, holding the petitioner entitled to retiral benefits while mentioning therein that payment to the petitioner was to be made by the Municipal Council, Abohar, whereafter revised speaking order Annexure R-1/2T was passed holding the petitioner entitled to retiral benefits to the tune of Rs. 16,81,394. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the aforesaid amount was paid to the petitioner prior to passing of speaking order Annexure R-1/2T, although the same was paid belatedly and that in view of the needful having been done, he does not press the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same while praying for liberty to take out proceedings in accordance with law for seeking interest on delay release of payment.

5. In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner the contempt 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.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

21.09.2022

nitin

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