

COCP-285-2021

Date of Decision :31.10.2022

Rashpal Singh

...Petitioner

versus

Bhumi Chand Thakur

....Respondent

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

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. AG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-4, dated 08.03.2019, in CWP-6338-2019.
2. A perusal of order Annexure P-4 reveals that CWP-6338-2019, was disposed of vide order dated 08.03.2019, by directing the respondent to decide the claim made in legal notice dated 06.12.2018, within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case it was found that the petitioner was entitled to any monetary benefits pursuant to decision of the legal notice, the same be paid to him within three months thereafter.
3. At the outset, learned State counsel refers to paragraph No.6 of the reply dated 19.08.2021, to contend that a speaking order, Annexure R/2 was passed on 10.10.2019, deciding the claim of the petitioner and the same was sent to the petitioner by speed post dated 11.10.2019 i.e. Annexure R/3 and thereafter as per instructions of Shri Harbhajan Singh, SDO, Ranjit Sagar Dam, who is present in Court, the following retiral dues have been

- i) leave encashment of Rs.3,39,350/-, GPF of Rs.11,89,307/- and GIS of Rs.9080/- released to the petitioner on 24.08.2020, 23.04.2020 and 14.05.2020 respectively ;
- ii) pension of the retiree was sanctioned by the Accountant General (A&E), Punjab, Chandigarh, vide letter No.PEN-19/2182097734/2020-21/PE/20/10/80188871 dated 30.06.2020, vide PPO No.1120097734 ;
- iii) DCRG amounting to Rs.3,73,285/-, was sanctioned on 30.06.2020 ;
- iv) difference of pensionary benefits i.e. DCRG amounting to Rs.1,35,740/-, revised pension enhanced from Rs.6,436/- to Rs.7,314/- was also sanctioned to the petitioner by the Accountant General (A&E), Punjab, Chandigarh, vide letter No.PEN07/Intimation/21-22/PE/21/15/80484679 dated 04.10.2021 and payment in respect thereof has also been made to the petitioner.

4. Despite intimation having been given that the instant case would be listed at 12:00 noon, none is present on behalf of the petitioner.

5. In the circumstances, I am of the view that no useful purpose would be served by adjourning the case as the needful has been done by complying with order Annexure P-4, dated 08.03.2019, in CWP-6338-2019. Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner for revival of the

5. Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

31.10.2022
ps

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