



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

203

COCP-3759-2024 (O&amp;M)

Date of Decision: August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025

Som Dutt

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Amrit Mohan Prasad and Anr.

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate with  
Ms. Roopan Atwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anita Balyan, Advocate  
for respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)**

1. The contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 04.12.2017 passed in CWP-17564-2016.

2. The relevant portion of order dated 04.12.2017 is reproduced as under:-

*“In other words enquiry was not held appropriately. The disciplinary authority has imposed major penalty which is shocking with reference to the alleged charge to the extent that certain money transaction has been made in the petitioner’s account and the same has been proved in connection with the corruption. Therefore, penalty imposed of removal from service is too harsh. Hence, orders of penalty as well as appellate authority/ies are set aside and the matter is*



*remanded to the disciplinary authority to impose any other penalty other than dismissal from service.”*

3. Union of India filed LPA No.349-2018, which was decided on 24.11.2022.

4. The relevant portion of the order dated 24.11.2022 passed by Division Bench of this Court in LPA-349-2018 is reproduced as under:-

*“We are, thus, of the considered opinion that the learned Single Judge as well justified to hold that the charge as such was never proved. We are also of the considered opinion that the defence as such that the amount had been received from the relatives and the father on account of an ailment was never even considered and the Commandant sat with closed eyes and in hell bent manner to dismiss the person within one and half hours without any justifiable reasons and with a pre determined mind.*

*Accordingly, we do not feel it as a fit case for interference and the present letters patent appeal stands dismissed.”*

4. Since the LPA filed by the respondent was dismissed vide judgment dated 24.11.2022, therefore, compliance report dated 13.05.2025 was filed by the respondents.

5. The relevant portion of the compliance report dated 13.05.2025 is reproduced as under:-

“”

4. A perusal of above shows that order dated 04.12.2017 passed in CWP-17564-2016 has been complied with. This facts is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner.



5. In view of the same contempt is purged and rule is discharged.

August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)

Sahil

JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No*

*Whether reportable : Yes/No*