

211 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCp-4167-2019

Date of Decision :29.03.2022

Sharanjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

M.S. Nijjar, Registrar and another

....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Ranjivan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate for respondents.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiating action against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of judgment, Annexure P/1 dated 30.04.2019 in CWP No.11130 of 2019 in case titled as Sharanjit Kaur vs. Punjabi University and another.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 dated 30.04.2019 reveals that CWP No. 11130 of 2019 was disposed of with a direction to the Punjabi University, Patiala to pass appropriate order on the claim of the petitioner(s) for grant of benefit of daily wage service while computing the qualifying service as well as interest on the delayed release of the payment keeping in view the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in ***Kesar Chand vs. State of Punjab and Ors, 1988 (2) PLR 223 as well as in A.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab, 1997 (3) SCT 468*** within three months.

[3] Pursuant to issuance of notice, although short reply was filed on behalf of respondent No.2, on 08.09.2020, yet today learned counsel for the respondents has filed reply of Prof. Varinder Kumar Kaushik,

Registrar, Punjabi University, Patiala present incumbent on the post of Registrar along with Annexure R-1/1 dated 29.06.2020 releasing payment of Rs.4,62,103/- on account of gratuity vide cheque dated 16.05.2019 and Rs.5,43,650/- on account of leave encashment vide cheque dated 15.04.2019 (by counting the benefit of daily wage service while computing qualifying service). The said reply along with Annexure R-1/1 dated 29.06.2020 is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not press the instant petition but liberty be granted to the petitioner to challenge Annexure R-1/1 dated 29.06.2020 to the extent it does not grant interest to the petitioner on the delayed release of payment.

[4] In view of Annexure R-1/1 dated 29.06.2020 having been passed in compliance of order, Annexure P/1 dated 30.04.2019 in CWP No.11130 of 2019 as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondents.

[5] Accordingly, 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.

[6] Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

29.03.2022

'Amit'

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