

Tarsem Chand Chopra

...Petitioner

versus

Sarvjit Singh, Principal Secretary to Govt. of Punjab and another

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. R.K. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ayush Sarna, AAG, Punjab.

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 CP/1 dated 02.03.2021, in CWP-20998-2019.

2. A perusal of order Annexure CP/1 reveals that CWP-20998-2019 was allowed, impugned order set aside while directing the petitioner to submit a detailed representation by giving comparative revised pay of retired BBMB employee and retired Punjab State employee and to apprise the competent authority to consider the grievance of the petitioner, that they were entitled to revised pay/pension while the respondents were directed that in case any representation was submitted to the State of Punjab, the same be considered within three months from the date of receipt of the same and decided by taking note of the decision of Hon'ble the Division Bench of this Court in CWP-6768-1996, in case titled as Nirmal Singh vs. State of Punjab and others.

3. At the outset, learned AAG, Punjab, has produced copy of orders dated 28.04.2022 and 13.05.2022, issued by the Senior Accounts Officer in the office of the Accountant General, (Accounts & Entitlement) Punjab, Chandigarh, informing the District Treasury Officer, Patiala, Punjab, of revision of the pension of the petitioner from Rs.7312/- per month to Rs.7900/- w.e.f. 01.01.1996 and from Rs.7900/- per month to Rs.25,450/- w.e.f. 01.01.2006. The aforementioned orders are taken on record. Copies thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who on perusal thereof states that in the circumstances, he does not press the instant petition but states that some of the amount as per the aforementioned orders dated 28.04.2022 and 13.05.2022 has not been released to the petitioner, therefore, liberty be granted to enable the petitioner to move a representation before the competent authority for release of the balance outstanding amount.

4. The same is not opposed to by the learned AAG, Punjab.

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

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

09.11.2022
'Rajesh/Rajneesh'

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