



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COCP-3021-2025(O&M)

Date of decision : 12.11.2025

Omender Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Anurag Rastogi and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Gourav Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

CM-13605-CII-2025

1. This is an application under Section 151 CPC for restoration of the contempt petition which was disposed of vide order dated 14.07.2025.
2. For the reasons stated in the application which is supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed and the order dated 14.07.2025 is recalled and the main petition is ordered to be restored to its original number.

Main case

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the writ petition was allowed in favour of the petitioners in terms of the judgment of



the learned Single Judge, against which LPA-1989-2025 and other connected matters have been filed and in the said LPA, a Division Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order on 11.07.2025:-

*“CM-4933-LPA-2025,
CM-4932-LPA-2025,
CM-4934-LPA-2025 in/and
LPA-1989-2025*

*STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
V/S
SHYAM SUNDER AND OTHERS*

*Present: Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. AG, Haryana for the
appellants.*

CM-4933-LPA-2025,

*For the reasons stated in the application, the same
is allowed and delay of 240 days in filing the appeal, is
condoned.*

LPA-1989-2025 (O&M)

*Learned counsel submits that while passing the
impugned judgment dated 04.10.2024, the learned Single
Bench has directed to release pay and allowances of the post of
Section Officer for the period the writ petitioners have
performed the duties of the said posts with all consequential
benefits. He submits that the words ‘**with all consequential
benefits**’ would also imply grant of increments and seniority,
which could not have been done.*

Notice of motion returnable for 17.11.205.

*In the meanwhile, the effect and operation of
directions ‘**with all consequential benefits**’ shall remain
stayed.*

11.07.2025”



It is submitted that the operation of the judgment only to the effect “with all consequential benefits” was ordered to be stayed and the rest of the judgment was not stayed. It is submitted that thus, the respondents were required to implement a part of the judgment of the Single Bench.

- 2. Learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that the said part of the judgment has already been complied with.
- 3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not disputed this fact and has submitted that in view of the said circumstances, the present contempt petition be disposed of but liberty be granted to the petitioners to revive the present contempt petition after decision in LPA-1989-2025 and connected matters, in case any cause survives.
- 4. In view of the above, the present contempt petition is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

November 12, 2025.
Davinder Kumar

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