

COCP-2522-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 10.05.2022

Basant Ram and anr

...Petitioners

Versus

Sukhjipal Singh and anr

....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Ashish Goklaney, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, AAG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition is for initiating action against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1 dated 30.01.2019, in CWP-11249-2017.

2. A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CWP-11249-2017 and connected case, was disposed of vide order dated 30.01.2019, in terms of decision in LPA-37-2017 and connected cases.

3. A perusal of order dated 25.09.2018, in LPA No.37-2017 and connected cases reveals that the same were disposed of by directing the respondents to consider and promote the Lecturers/Masters/Mistresses on higher posts as per their seniority and other eligibility conditions in terms of order dated 23.05.2017 while the respondents in the lead case and the writ petitioners in the connected petitions were ordered to be considered for regular promotion as per their seniority.

4. Learned counsel contends that the claim of petitioner No.1

has been rejected while the claim of petitioner No.2 has been allowed in

terms of the aforementioned decision. Learned counsel further contends that the matter is pending in the office of Accountant General, Punjab, for revision of pension, therefore, the petitioners are not interested in pursuing the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same with liberty to challenge rejection of the claim qua petitioner No.1 and prays for issuance of directions to respondent No.2 to do the needful and revise the pension of petitioner No.2, within a stipulated period of time.

5. In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, 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 petitioner No.1 to challenge order rejecting his claim by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law while respondent No. 2 is directed to revise the pension of petitioner No.2 and release the benefits to him as per his entitlement, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within two months from today.

6. Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

10.05.2022
rajesh

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