



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No. 2776 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.09.2024

Uma Shankar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Dr. Baldev Raj Kamboj, Vice Chancellor,
Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural
University, Hisar and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Arshit Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen S. Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Sections 11 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, prayer has been made for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents on account of alleged willful non-compliance of interim order dated 22.07.2024 (**Annexure P-2**) passed by this Court in CWP No. 15038 of 2024, which reads as under:-

“ *Inter alia relies on the issuance of notice and grant of interim protection in CWP-14541 of 2024 – Nirottam Lal and others Vs. State of Haryana and others.*

Notice of motion for 21.08.2024.

Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Addl. A. G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents.

To be heard along with CWP-14541-2024.

In the meanwhile, purely as an interim measure, the respondents are restrained from making any recovery from the petitioners who have opted for commuted pension and

have already repaid 120 installments.”

[2] Reply by way of affidavit dated 07.09.2024 of Sh. Naveen Jain, Comptroller, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, filed on behalf of the respondents, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to the opposite side.

[3] Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the necessary instructions to the concerned bank have already been issued by the respondents and the needful, as regards the refund in favour of the petitioner, shall be done within a period of three weeks from today

[4] In view of the aforesaid stand / undertaking, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the present petition any further.

[5] **Dismissed as not pressed.**

[6] However, in case the needful is not done within the afore-stated period, as per undertaking, the petitioner would be at liberty to seek revival of the present contempt petition and in that eventuality, the erring / concerned officer(s) would be liable to pay additional sum of Rs.1,00,000/- as costs from his/her own pocket in favour of the petitioner towards litigation expenses, immediately, i.e. on the first date of listing of revival application.

[7] Rule stands discharged.

September 12, 2024
'dk kamra'

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>