

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

104

**COCp-1397-2025
Decided on:03.04.2025**

Suman Rani and another

. . . Petitioners

Versus

Sujan Singh Yadav and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Anshul Lubana, Advocate for
Mr. Samrat Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Contempt Petition has been filed under Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act for not complying with the interim order dated 30.11.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed in CWP-4674-2022.
2. In compliance to the order dated 30.11.2023 (Annexure P-1), learned State counsel has produced on record the compliance report dated 03.04.2025, which is taken on record. A perusal of the same would show that the order dated 02.04.2025 has been passed in compliance to the order dated 30.11.2023 and the relevant portion of the same reads as under:-

“After taken into consideration above mentioned facts, General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Kurukshetra vide memo no. 114/PAC dated 01.02.2024 (copy enclosed) has requested the Director General, State Transport, Haryana, Chandigarh to appoint the son of the petitioner namely Aryan Kumar on the post of Group 'D' under Ex-gratia Policy, 2019 as General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Kurukshetra is not competent authority to appoint the son of the petitioner on the post of Group 'D'



under the Ex-gratia Policy, 2019. Now, appointment letter on the post of Group 'D' under the Ex-gratia Policy, 2019 will be issued to the son of the petitioner namely Aryan Kumar after received approval from the Director General, State Transport, Haryana, Chandigarh through proper channel.

In view of the foregoing finding, I accept the claim made by the petitioner."

3. Learned State counsel has further submitted that every endeavour would be made to make the final decision as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from today.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of the same, he does not want to press the present petition at this stage.
5. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of as not pressed.

03.04.2025

Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE