



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COC-980-2026(O&M)
Date of decision: 09.03.2026

Oma

... Petitioner

Versus

Sudhir Rajpal, IAS, and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Mannu Singh Sheokand, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The instant contempt petition alleges willful disobedience of order dated 13.03.2024 (Annexure P-1), passed in CWP-28241-2017, vide which the following directions were issued:-

“43. In view of the above, the writ petitions are disposed of in the 9 terms and conditions mentioned herein before. Let the respondent-State pass appropriate speaking order as directed herein before. In case, any of the petitioner is found entitled for regularization/retrospective regularization of services from the date employees junior to him/her has been regularized, they will be granted the said date of regularization otherwise due reasons be mentioned in the speaking order keeping in mind the directions given by the Court herein before so as to decide the eligibility of each petitioners qua their respective claims. Further in case any of the petitioners is found entitled for regularization of his services retrospectively the said benefit shall be given notionally, no arrears will be granted to the petitioners up to the date of filing of the respective



petitions. The petitioners will be entitled for fixing of their salaries from the date of regularization notionally and the arrears will only be extended from the date of filing of their respective petitions before this Court and if any of the petitioners has already retired, his/her pensionary benefits will also be fixed/revised and arrears will also be extended from the date of filing the petition by the said petitioner.”

- 2. Learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, has produced a copy of the speaking order dated 31.03.2025, which is taken on record as **Mark ‘X’**. He submits that the said order was passed as far back as on 31.03.2025, vide which the claim of the petitioner has been rejected.
- 3. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said order had never been supplied to the petitioner.
- 4. Be that as it may, a copy of the speaking order, as mentioned above, has now been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner. Accordingly, he submits that in view of the speaking order having been passed, the petitioner does not wish to press the instant contempt petition. However, the petitioner shall, if so advised, avail all such other remedies as shall be admissible in law against the said order.
- 5. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(**VIKRAM AGGARWAL**)
JUDGE

March 9, 2026
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No