

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

COCN No.1629 of 2022

Date of Decision :14.09.2022

Madhu Bala

...Petitioner

versus

Prof. Rajendra Kumar Anayath, Vice-Chancellor,
Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science &
Technology, Murthal, Sonapat, Haryana and anotherRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Bhupinder Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Jagbir Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 05.04.2022, in CWP No.7166 of 2022 in case titled as '**Madhu Bala versus Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that while CWP No.7166 of 2022 was dismissed vide order dated 05.04.2022, direction was issued that the petitioner be considered for promotion to the post of Deputy Superintendent on her fulfilling the requisite experience.

[3] Reply has been filed by on behalf of respondent No.2. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

[4] Learned counsel for respondent No.2 refers to order (Annexure R-2/6) dated 05.09.2022, as per which, after consideration,

case of the petitioner for promotion was declined for the time being on account of there being 11 Assistant-cum-DEO / Assistants, senior to the petitioner as per *inter-se* seniority and promotions to the post of Deputy Superintendent to be made as per vacancy / availability of the post of Deputy Superintendent.

[5] Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not press the instant petition but prays for liberty to challenge order (Annexure R-2/6) dated 05.09.2022 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 respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

[7] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

14.09.2022

'Rajneesh'

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