

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

COCN No.2055 of 2022

Date of Decision :23.11.2022

Meena Kumari and others

...Petitioners

versus

Amneet P. Kumar, IAS, Addl.
Chief Secretary and another

....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Ravinder Malik (Ravi), Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 05.10.2021, in CWP No.20293 of 2021 in case titled as '**Meena Kumari and others** versus **State of Haryana and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No.20293 of 2021 was disposed of vide order dated 05.10.2021 by directing the competent authority to look into the grievance of the petitioners as contained in representation dated 01.07.2020 and also by keeping in view the contentions raised in the writ petition and by treating the same as supplementary representation and take a decision in respect thereto, in accordance with law.

[3] Learned DAG, Haryana, has filed short reply by way of affidavit of Ms. Monika Malik, Director, Women and Child Development Department, Haryana, on behalf of respondent No.2. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners, who on

perusal of orders (Annexure R-I & R-II) dated 16.11.2022 and 21.11.2022 states that in view of the claim of the petitioners as contained in representation dated 01.07.2020 having been rejected vide orders (Annexure R-I & R-II), he does not press the instant petition but prays for grant of liberty to the petitioners to challenge orders / copy of the minutes of meeting Annexure R-I and copy of speaking order (Annexure R-II) dated 16.11.2022 and 22.11.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

[4] 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 the petitioners as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

23.11.2022
'Rajneesh'

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