

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

COCN No.767 of 2020

Date of Decision :22.09.2022

Rekha Rani ...Petitioner

versus

Amneet P. Kumar, IAS, Director, Secondary
Education Haryana, Sector 5, Panchakula.Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Lalit Pardhan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 16.10.2019, in CWP No.29749 of 2019 in case titled as '**Rekha Rani** versus **State of Haryana and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order Annexure (P-1) reveals that CWP No.29749 of 2019 was disposed of vide order dated 16.10.2019 by directing the respondent to decide representation dated 12.09.2019 by passing a reasoned and speaking order within two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case, the representation was not decided within the stipulated period of time, costs of Rs.25,000/- were to be paid by the concerned officer to the petitioner.

[3] Learned DAG, Haryana, has filed reply by way of affidavit of respondent No.1 dated 09.11.2020 is already on record.

[4] Learned DAG, Haryana, states that claim of the petitioner as contained in representation dated 12.09.2019 has been decided vide order

dated 06.07.2020 and in the circumstances, costs of Rs.25,000/- have also been paid to the petitioner.

[5] Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of rejection of the claim of the petitioner vide speaking order (Annexure R-1) dated 06.07.2020, he does not press the instant petition but prays for grant of liberty to the petitioner to challenge order (Annexure R-1) dated 06.07.2020 by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

[6] 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 the petitioner, as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

22.09.2022
'Rajneesh'

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