



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COCP-3012-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 04.11.2025

Vijay Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

Gaurav Yadav, IPS

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar, Advocate, for
Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shiny Chopra, AAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The instant contempt petition has been preferred under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, alleging willful disobedience of the directions passed vide order dated 19.05.2023 in CWP-798-2023:-

“14. In view of above, present writ petitions are allowed. Impugned orders dated 14.02.2019 (Annexure P-4) in CWP No.14202 of 2019 and 01.02.2019 (Annexure P-4) in CWP No.798 of 2023 are hereby quashed. The petitioners are ordered to be reinstated in service with all consequential benefits.

15. Needful be done within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.”

2. Short reply by way of affidavit of Director General of Police, Punjab, filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

3. In the said reply, it has been submitted that in compliance of the aforesaid directions, the claim of the petitioner was considered and a speaking order dated 29.01.2024 (Annexure R-1) was passed, vide which the



petitioner was reinstated in service and the time from dismissal to his reinstatement was considered as his duty period.

4. Further, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI (LR) Rajwinder Singh, Civil Suit Clerk, SSP Office, Sangrur, submits that the entire consequential benefits amounting to Rs.40,70,300/- stand released to the petitioner.

5. However, learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that as per his instructions, the entire benefits have not been paid.

6. Keeping in view the statement given by learned State counsel on instructions from the concerned official, no further orders are required to be passed. Needless to assert, the petitioner shall be at liberty to avail all such other remedies as shall be admissible in law against the speaking order (Annexure R-1).

7. Rule stands discharged.

8. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

November 4, 2025

Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No