

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

COCp-3131-2019

Date of Decision :14.12.2022

Om Parkash Bansal and others

...Petitioners

versus

Dr. Manjit Singh Nijjar, Registrar,
Punjabi University, Patiala

....Respondent

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

Present : None for the petitioners.
Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate for the respondent.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 30.04.2019, in CWP-11110-2019 in case titled as '**Om Parkash Bansal and others versus Punjabi University, Patiala.**'

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP-11110-2019 was disposed of by directing the respondent to decide claim made in legal notice dated 04.02.2019 by passing a speaking order within two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[3] Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent has produced copy of speaking order dated 22.05.2020, deciding the representation, allowing the benefits as claimed therein and disbursing the benefits payable in respect thereto. Order dated 22.05.2020, is taken on record. Copy is stated to have already been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

[4] Despite the case having been called out twice, Mr. Mukesh

Arora, learned counsel is not present on behalf of the petitioners.

[5] Learned counsel for the respondent states that in view of the needful having been done in compliance of order (Annexure P-1), the instant petition is liable to be disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[6] I have considered the submission of learned counsel for the respondent and in view of the position noted above, especially of compliance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 30.04.2019, in CWP-11110-2019 vide speaking order dated 22.05.2020 and benefits as per entitlement determined therein also having been released, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petition pending.

[7] Accordingly, in the light of the position noted above, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioner to move an application for revival of the instant petition if cause survives.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

14.12.2022

'Rajneesh'

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