

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

COCP No.565 of 2022

Date of Decision : 20.04.2022

Sarla Devi ...Petitioner

versus

Sanjeev Kaushal, IAS, Chief Secretary,
Govt. of Haryana, ChandigarhRespondent

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

Present : Mr. Ajay Vijorania, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating action against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 20.08.2021 in CWP No.9041 of 2021 in case titled as 'Sarla Devi versus State of Haryana and others'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No.9041 of 2021 was disposed of vide order dated 20.08.2021 by directing the respondent to decide representation dated 14.01.2021 submitted by the petitioner and take a conscious decision thereon by passing a speaking order within 03 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case the petitioner was found entitled to any pecuniary benefits, to release the same to the petitioner within 03 months thereafter.

[3] Learned State Counsel has filed a short reply by way of affidavit of the respondent along with speaking order (Annexure R-1), accepting part of the claim of the petitioner and holding her entitled to

supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who on perusal thereof states that in the circumstances, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same with directions to the respondent to release the financial benefits determined vide Annexure R-1 within a stipulated period of time as also by granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge Annexure R-1 to the extent, it denies benefits as claimed by the petitioner in her representation dated 14.01.2021.

[4] The aforementioned course of action is not opposed to by the learned State Counsel.

[5] Accordingly, 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 directing the respondent to ensure release of benefits accruing to the petitioner in terms of order (Annexure R-1) within 06 weeks from today, while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

20.04.2022
'Rajneesh'

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