

102 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CM No.9907-CII of 2020 and
COCP-4103-2019

Date of Decision :05.08.2022

Jagmohan Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Shekhar Vidyarthi and anotherRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. M.S. Tewatia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Viresh Dahiya, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate for the respondent/HAFED.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

CM No.9907-CII of 2020

For the reasons as are mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Reply by way of affidavit of Sh. Dusmanta K. Behera, Managing Director, HAFED is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

Main Case

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1 dated 06.03.2019 in CWP No.6077 of 2019 in case titled as Jagmohan Singh vs. State of Haryana and others.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CWP No.6077 of 2019 was disposed of by directing the respondents to pass appropriate speaking order on the claim raised by the petitioner in the legal notice

dated 26.12.2017 within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case it was found that the petitioner was entitled to any monetary benefits, to release the same to him within next three months.

[3] Learned counsel appearing for the respondents refers to order, Annexure R/1 dated 25.06.2020 to contend that in compliance of order, Annexure P/1, part of the claim of the petitioner has been accepted and balance gratuity amount of Rs.1,69,895/- released to him after adjusting an amount of Rs.7,51,129/-.

[4] Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in the circumstances the petitioner does not press the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same with liberty to challenge order, Annexure R/1 dated 25.06.2020 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law to the extent the same is against the interest of the petitioner.

[5] In view of the position noted above as well as the statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the contempt 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 petitioner as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

05.08.2022
'Amit'

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