



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

**CACP-63-2025 (O&M)**  
**DATE OF DECISION : 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2025**

**Haldhar Kumar and others**

**.... Petitioners**

**Versus**

**Deepam Anand Singh and another**

**.... Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

**\* \* \***

Present : Mr.Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with  
Mr.Vivek Singla, Advocate and  
Mr.Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate  
for the appellants.

Ms.Ankita Sambyal, Advocate and  
Mr.Shubham Saini, Advocate  
for the respondent.

**\* \* \***

**SHEEL NAGU, CJ. (Oral)**

1. The Contempt Petition (COCP-2985-2025) was filed, primarily, alleging non-compliance and disobedience of the final order dated 04.11.2024 passed by Single Bench of this Court in CWP-18689-2024, wherein, following directions were issued:-

*“20. After hearing learned counsels for the parties and considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this court is of the considered view that the present petition deserves to succeed and accordingly, is allowed. Impugned*



*orders at Annexure P-17 based upon Annexure R-2 and Annexure P-34 are hereby set aside and quashed. A direction is issued to the respondent-Institute to declare the result of the petitioner of 3rd Semester of first year which according to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already taken the examinations. The Institute is further directed to permit the petitioner to continue his studies in the normal course, without insisting on repeating the year with full fees.*

*21. So far as the order at Annexure P-7, whereby the petitioner was expelled from the hostel residence facility, is concerned, the petitioner shall be at liberty to make a representation to the Board of Governors for the restoration of the hostel facility. In case such a representation is filed, the Board of Governors shall consider it in accordance with the law and pass an order thereon.*

*22. Since the career of the petitioner has been affected by the illegal action of the respondent-Institute whereby the punishment order was passed by an authority not competent or authorized to do so and the Director passed the appellate order without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and also without considering the grounds taken by the petitioner in the appeal and without even determining as to whether the authority that imposed the punishment was competent to pass the order or not, the petitioner shall be entitled for costs of Rs.1,00,000/-(one lac), which shall be paid to the petitioner by the respondent-institute within a period of three months from today. The aforesaid amount of costs shall be paid to the petitioner by the respondent-institute at the first instance. Thereafter, the Board of Governors shall be at liberty to fix*



*accountability for the officer(s) concerned, including the Director of the respondent-Institute, and recover the amount from the concerned officer(s) in accordance with law.”*

2. This Court while taking cognizance of this appeal on 10.07.2025 had stayed the operation of the order impugned herein, passed on 07.07.2025 in CACP-2985-2025, which is in the following terms:-

*“Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has produced the record pertaining to the petitioner, which is taken on record as Mark ‘X’ and made part of the present file.*

*Registry to tag the same at appropriate place and paginate the same.*

*A perusal of the record shows that the present is an unfortunate case where by its conduct, the respondent Management Institute is clearly been reflected of making an effort to ruin the entire career of a 20 years old boy by not permitting him to join the institute and also by awarding him Grade ‘F’ despite the fact that he has attained almost 58.33% marks in the ‘Law of Partnership’, 37.30% marks in ‘Law of Crimes-II’ and 96.37% marks in ‘Game Theory’.*

*In such circumstances, list on 11.07.2025.*

*Be shown in the urgent list, henceforth.*

*Respondents are requested to remain present in Court in person”*

3. It is pertinent to mention subsequent event of dismissal of COCP-2985-2025 as withdrawn vide order dated 11.07.2025 on the request of petitioner in the Contempt Petition, in the following terms:-



*“Learned counsel representing petitioner does not press the present petition while submitting that the order passed by the Contempt Court has been stayed in an Intra-Court Appeal i.e. CACP-63-2025, however, seeks liberty to revive the present petition, subject to final outcome of the CACP.*

*Dismissed as not pressed with the aforesaid liberty.”*

3.1 In the backdrop of withdrawal of COCP-2985-2025, the interim order which was passed on 07.07.2025 also ceased to exist.

4. However, learned senior counsel for the appellants contends that in view of the liberty extended by order dated 11.07.2025 in COCP-2985-2025, if this appeal is declared to be infructuous, then respondent No.1 would revive COCP-2985-2025, which in turn rejuvenates the impugned order dated 07.07.2025, which is adverse to the interest of the appellants – contemnor.

4.1 This Court has no manner of doubt that any interim order that is passed in a petition gets merged in the final order, and applying the said principle the interlocutory order dated 07.07.2025 does not survive any more in view of withdrawal of COCP-2985-2025.

4.2 As regards the grievance raised by learned senior counsel for the appellants about the concept of liberty granted in the Contempt Petition, this Court finds that by passing the impugned interim order dated 07.07.2025, the Contempt Court travelled beyond its jurisdiction by referring to the marks obtained by respondent No.1 in 5<sup>th</sup> Semester of second year, whereas, it is settled law that the Contempt Court could not have travelled beyond four corners of the directions given in CWP-



18689-2024 decided on 04.11.2024. This direction, which is evident from paragraph 20 of the said order was to declare the result of petitioner of 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester of first year and not 5<sup>th</sup> Semester of second Year.

5. The Contempt Court is advised to refrain from exceeding the contempt jurisdiction, which ought not to be enlarged to include subject matters not adjudicated upon and there being no directions in the order/judgment, whose non-compliance is alleged before Contempt Court.

6. With the aforesaid observations, this Contempt Appeal is dismissed as infructuous since impugned order dated 07.07.2025 having ceased to exist on 11.07.2025 when COCP-2985-2025 was dismissed as withdrawn.

( SHEEL NAGU )  
CHIEF JUSTICE

15<sup>th</sup> July, 2025  
*‘gian’*

( SANJIV BERRY )  
JUDGE

|                                   |            |           |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i> | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable:</i>        | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> |