

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

COCN No.4216 of 2019

Date of Decision : 14.07.2022

Satish Kumar Verma, Principal (Retd.)  
s/o Late Shri Ram Lal

...Petitioner

versus

Krishan Kumar, Principal Secretary, School  
Education, Punjab and others

....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Mukesh Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Aditya Sharda, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*

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 28.01.2019, in CWP No.2270 of 2019 in case titled as 'Satish Kumar VermaversusThe State of Punjab and others'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that CWP No.2270 of 2019, was disposed of by directing the respondents to pass appropriate speaking order on the claim raised by the petitioner in legal notice dated 26.11.2018 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 benefit, to release the same to the petitioner within next three months.

[3] Reply dated 18.01.2021 has been filed along with Annexure R-1 (dated 28.01.2020) i.e. cheque for a sum of Rs.32,167/- on account of payment towards claim of the petitioner in legal notice dated 26.11.2018.

[4] Learned Asstt. AG, Punjab, has also placed on record copy of speaking order dated 04.07.2019, rejecting the claim for payment of interest on account of delayed payment of retiral benefits. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who on perusal thereof as well as the reply 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 speaking order dated 04.07.2019 to the extent the same denies payment of interest on delayed payment of retiral benefits by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[5] 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, while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)  
Judge

14.07.2022

'Rajneesh'

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