

CM-3298-CII-2022 in/and
COCP-389-2020
Date of Decision :22.03.2022

Bal Krishan

...Petitioner

versus

Parneet Kaur Shergill, IAS

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Ms.Nistha Grover, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. AbhilakshGaind, Advocate for the respondent.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)**CM-3298-CII-2022**

1. Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

2. For the reasons as are mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

COCP-389-2020

3. Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order Annexure P/1 dated 15.09.2021, in CWP-17396-2021, in case titled as Bal Krishan vs. PEPSU Road Transport Corporation, Nabha Road, Patiala,

4. A perusal of order Annexure P/1 dated 15.09.2021 reveals that CWP-17396-2021, was disposed of by directing the respondent to consider legal notice dated 05.03.2020, as representation and decide the same in accordance with law by passing a speaking order, within one month from the date of order and in case the petitioner was found entitled to the relief claimed and there was no impediment for grant of the same,

to release the same to him without any delay, in accordance with law.

5. Learned counsel contends that the instant petition was filed on account of failure of the respondents to do the needful.

6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent refers to the affidavit filed indicating that gratuity and pension of the petitioner had been revised from Rs.9795/- to Rs.9945/- and amount due to the petitioner on account of difference in gratuity as well as arrears on account of revised pension totaling Rs.59,017/-, had been deposited in SBI A/c No.65019835197 of the petitioner on 21.03.2022,.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner on perusal of the affidavit states that in view of needful having been done and the petitioner having been released payment due to him as per his entitlement, in terms of order dated 15.09.2021, in CWP-17396-2021, the petitioner does not press the instant petition and the same may be disposed of as such.

8. Accordingly, in the light 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.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

22.03.2022

rajesh

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