

COCp-3210-2019(O&M)
Date of Decision :01.06.2022

Manjit Kaur

...Petitioner

versus

Mukesh Kumar Bansal and another

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Ashish Goklaney, Advocate for
Mr. P.K. Goklaney, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sehaj Bir Singh, Advocate for the respondent.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondent(s) for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 29.11.2018, in CWP-8859-2017.

2. A perusal of order Annexure P-1 dated 29.11.2018, reveals that CWP No.8859-2017, was allowed in terms of decision in CWP-1013-2017, in case titled as Balvir Singh vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Limited/PSPCL and another and as per the decision in Balvir Singh's case (supra), the petitioner therein was held entitled to grant of advance promotional increment after 23 years of service with arrears of promotional increment to be restricted to 36 months from the date of filing of the writ petition and in case financial benefits were not released to the petitioner within two months, the same were to carry interest @ 6% per annum till realization.

3. On 20.05.2022, on reply being filed, learned counsel for the petitioner had contended that although arrears had been paid in terms of

the decision in Balvir Singh's case (supra), yet interest thereon @ 6% per annum had not been paid on the delayed payment.

4. Today, learned counsel for the respondent has handed over cheque No.903697 dated 30.05.2022, issued by the Punjab State Power Corporation, City Division, Moga, in the name of the petitioner, for an amount of Rs.8,350/-, in account No.65138896507 towards payment of interest. Photocopy of the aforementioned cheque is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent on instructions from Mr. Amarjjit Singh, Addl. SE, City Division, PSPCL, Moga, states that amount of Rs.8,350/- would be credited in the account of the petitioner today.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in the circumstances, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same.

7. 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. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application for revival of the instant petition in the eventuality of the amount as aforesaid not being credited in the account of the petitioner.

8. Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

01.06.2022

rajesh