

[119] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No.741 of 2020
Date of Decision :12.10.2022

Nirmal Kaur ...Petitioner

versus

Krishan Kumar, IAS, Secretary, Department
of School Education, Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh
and othersRespondents

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

Present : Ms.Saguna Arora, Advocate for
Mr. R.K. Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ayush Sarna, Asstt. AG, Punjab.

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 27.01.2020, in CWP No.14213 of 2013.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) dated 27.01.2020 reveals that CWP No.14213 of 2013 was decided in terms of CWP No.10670 of 2010 in case titled as '**Liaqat Ali and others**versus**State of Punjab and others**', whereas perusal of CWP No.10670 of 2010 dated 27.01.2020 reveals that the said writ petition was disposed of by issuing directions that all the petitioners who had higher merit i.e. more marks than the last selected General Category candidate be issued appointment letters, if not already issued, within two days, besides such candidates be treated to have been appointed with effect from the date, the last General Category candidate was appointed to the post of ETT Teacher as also holding them entitled to all

notional benefits and actual financial benefits from the date they joined/would join service.

[3] At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner states that vide order (Annexure R-1) dated 07.03.2020, the petitioner has been issued appointment letter, therefore, she does not press the instant petition but prays for grant of liberty to the petitioner to pursue the matter with the respondents for grant of notional benefits in terms of decision as referred to above.

[4] The same is not opposed to by the learned Asstt. AG, Punjab.

[5] 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 respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

12.10.2022

'Rajneesh'

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>