



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

110

COCP-1644-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.04.2026

Vijay Maheshi and others

...Petitioners

V/s

Sh. Arshdeep Singh Thind and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Abhay Ahir, Advocate, for
Mr. Umaid Singh Mann, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Ms. Shiny Chopra, AAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

CWP-795-2024 along with other connected petitions was decided vide order dated 05.08.2024 (Annexure P-1) and the following directions had been issued:-

“Learned State counsel on instructions from Mr. Gurmail Singh, D.DA (Headquarter) concedes the factum that no opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioners before passing the impugned order reducing the salaries. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the impugned order which has been passed reducing the salaries of the petitioners be treated as withdrawn with liberty to pass afresh order on the same cause of action by giving due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner to present their case in writing and whatever the objections will be taken by the petitioners to the proposed action, the same will be considered by the competent authority and an appropriate speaking order will be passed and in case, it is found feasible to accept the objections, the same will be accepted, otherwise due reasons will be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioners in the speaking order to be passed which will be conveyed to them and action will be taken in terms of the speaking order to be passed.”

2. Concededly, in compliance of the aforesaid directions, speaking orders have been passed and learned counsel for the petitioners submits that separate writ petitions assailing the said order have been instituted.

3. The grievance which has been brought forthwith by learned counsel for the petitioners is as regards the payment for the intervening period, which, on instructions, learned State counsel submits, shall be paid within a period of four weeks, subject to the right of recovery, in accordance with law and the outcome of the pending litigation.

4. That being so, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that no grievance subsists at this stage and the petitioners do not wish to press the present contempt petition.

5. In view of the statements given by learned counsel for the parties, the present contempt petition is disposed of as having been not pressed, at this stage.

6. Needless to assert that both sides shall remain bound by the statements given in Court today.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

April 16, 2026

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No