



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(211)

COCN No.1398 of 2025
Date of Decision: 03.04.2025

Jai Narayan and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Rahul Huda

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Karan Kumar Goyal, Advocate for
Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The petitioners allege disobedience of the order dated
20.11.2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench in CWP No.31242 of 2024:-

“The petition has been filed inter alia seeking a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to pay remuneration of ₹757,700 per month, instead of ₹735,400, to the petitioners who are re-employed Extension Lecturers.

2. The claim is based upon judgment, dated 21.07.2023, passed by this Court in Civil Writ Petition No.15114 of 2021 titled Dr. Balwinder Singh & another v. State of Haryana & others. Letters Patent Appeal against the judgment stands dismissed by the Division Bench vide order dated 24.04.2024, rendered/in LPA No.724 of 2024.

3. Learned State counsel does not dispute that the petitioners herein are similarly placed as the petitioners in Dr. Balwinder Singh case ibid.

4. In view thereof, the petition is allowed in terms of Dr. Balwinder Singh case (supra), by directing the respondents to pay from the date of their appointment as Extension

Lecturers, ad release the arrears of difference of remuneration to them within a period of six weeks of receiving a certified copy of this order.”

2. Today, learned counsel for the respondents has produced copies of orders dated 25.11.2024 and 20.01.2025 passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (C) No. 37604 of 2024 and Civil Appeal No.13242 of 2024 respectively, vide which contempt proceedings arising out of the judgment dated 24.04.2024 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.724 of 2024 have been stayed and the stay has been ordered to operate till the final disposal of the appeal.

3. That being so, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the present contempt petition at this stage with liberty of reviving the same or filing a fresh petition on the same cause of action after the decision in the Civil Appeal referred to above.

4. Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty aforesaid.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

April 03, 2025
Rekha

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