

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

COCp-2506-2022

Date of Decision :23.12.2022

Manjeet Singh Gill

...Petitioner

versus

Gaurav Yadav, Director General of Police, Punjab
Police Head Quarters, Sector 9, Chandigarh.

....Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Parvez Chug, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ajit Singh Natt, Asstt. AG, Punjab.

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 03.08.2021, in CWP-14544-2021 in case titled as '**Manjeet Singh versus State of Punjab and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP-14544-2021 was disposed of by directing the respondent to decide representation dated 08.06.2021 by passing a speaking order within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case, on decision, it was found that the petitioner was entitled for any monetary benefits, to release the same to him within a period of next one month.

[3] Learned Asstt. AG, Punjab, has filed reply on behalf of the respondent along with copy of speaking order (Annexure R/1) dated 14.12.2022, accepting the claim of the petitioner as contained in representation dated 08.06.2021. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who on perusal

thereof states that in view of order (Annexure R/1), he does not press the instant petition but prays for directions to the respondent to release payment as per entitlement determined vide Annexure R-1 within one month of 14.12.2022.

[4] Learned Asstt. AG, Punjab, on instructions from *Shri Gurjant Singh*, from the *office of the SSP, Fazilka*, states that instructions have already been issued to the concerned SSP to take up the matter with the Accountant General, to release payment as per entitlement determined vide Annexure R/1 expeditiously and that necessary follow-up would be done to ensure compliance with the order.

[5] In view of the circumstances 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 in the eventuality of needful not being done in terms of order (Annexure P-1).

[6] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

23.12.2022

'Rajneesh'

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>