

Naresh Kumar Jain

...Petitioner

versus

Satish Agarwal

....Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana.

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-2, dated 10.09.2019, in CWP-25204-2019.

2. A perusal of order Annexure P-2 reveals that CWP-25204-2019, was disposed of by directing the respondent to decide the claim of the petitioner as made in legal notice dated 08.04.2019, by passing a speaking order within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and if on decision, it was found that the petitioner was entitled to any monetary benefits, to release the same to him within three months thereafter.

3. Learned AAG, Haryana, has filed compliance report along with Annexure R/1. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof is stated to have already been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Learned AAG, Haryana, while referring to speaking order Annexure R/1 dated 27.09.2022, states that the claim of the petitioner has

been accepted to the extent of Rs.3,74,434/-, out of the claimed amount of Rs.4,04,906/-, in accordance with the Haryana Government Policy dated 21.05.2005, on account of medical reimbursement and that in the circumstances no further action is called for.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the needful having been done in compliance of order Annexure P/1 dated 10.09.2019, the petitioner does not press the instant petition but prays for grant of liberty to the petitioner to challenge order Annexure R/1 dated 27.09.2022, to the extent the same denies full payment as claimed by the petitioner, by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law

6. The same is not opposed to by the learned AAG, Haryana.

7. In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to petitioner to challenge order Annexure R/1 dated 27.09.2022, to the extent the same denies full payment as claimed by the petitioner.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

28.09.2022

rajesh

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