

2024:PHHC:113521

139 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARHCOCP-2876-2024
Decided on:-02.09.2024

Pushpa Devi

....Petitioner..

VS.

R.K. Khosla, Chief Engineer Department of
Punjab Water Supply & Sanitation, Punjab
and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. P.K. Goklaney, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasleen Kaur Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, prayer has been made for issuance of contempt proceedings against the respondents on account of alleged non-compliance of order dated 05.07.2023 passed by this Court in CWP-22575-2015. The operative part thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“In view thereof, the order passed by the Chief Engineer dated 20.04.2015 is hereby quashed. The respondents are directed to pass orders accordingly within a period of 3 months with all consequential benefits.”

2. In response, compliance report by way of affidavit dated 02.09.2024 of Mr. Shaminder Singh, Executive Engineer, Water Supply &

Sanitation, Division No.2, Sri Muktsar Sahib on behalf of respondent No.3 has been filed in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner has been granted the benefit of regularization on the post of Clerk w.e.f. 23.01.2001 and the consequential benefits are being assessed and the same shall be released to the petitioner within a period of 04 weeks from today.

3. In view of the aforesaid stand taken by the learned State counsel representing the respondents, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition.

However, the petitioner would be at liberty to seek revival, in case the needful is not done within the aforementioned stipulated period. It is made clear that in an eventuality wherein, the petitioner seeks revival on account of in action of the respondents, the concerned officer would be liable to pay a sum of Rs.1 lakh as costs from his/her own pocket in favour of the petitioner.

4. Disposed of accordingly. Rule stands discharged.

02.09.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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