

COCp-514-2020

Date of Decision :04.08.2022

Baldev Krishan Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

TVSN Parsad and Ors.

....Respondents

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

Present : None for the petitioner.
 Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1 dated 17.11.2018 in CWP No.7312 of 2016 in case titled as Baldev Krishan Sharma vs. State of Haryana and Ors.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CWP No.7312 of 2016 was allowed and the respondents directed to give / paysalary of the post of Section Officer to the petitioner in the scale of Rs.9300-34800+4600 Grade Pay + Rs.100 as special pay along with interest at the rate of 6% per annum with effect from the date of his appointment till payment.

[3] Learned DAG by referring to the sanction order, Annexure R/2 dated 28.08.2020 qua the benefits admissible to the petitioner as also to para Nos.4 and 6 of the reply contends that benefits as admissible to the petitioner in terms of order, Annexure P/1 were sanctioned vide order, Annexure R/2 and payment of Rs.2,00,931/- made in the bank

account of the petitioner's wife Smt. Ritu Sharma vide EPS

No.0300167631 on 26.10.2020 (Annexure R/3) on account of death of the petitioner.

[4] Despite the case having been passed over in the pre-lunch session and intimation sent to counsel for the petitioner to ensure representation, none is present on behalf of the petitioner despite second call.

[5] In view of the reply referred to above as well as sanction order, Annexure R/2 as also details of payment made to the wife of the petitioner in terms of entitlement of the petitioner and copy of reply having been stated to be supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, it appears that in the circumstances non-representation on behalf of the petitioner is on account of the needful having been done therefore, the petitioner not being interested in pursuing the instant case.

[6] Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

04.08.2022
'Amit'

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