



CWP-13089-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

(109)

CWP-13089-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 30.04 2026

Union of India and others

.. Petitioners

Versus

Heena and another

.. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. D.C.Mittal, Senior Panel Counsel
for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal') dated 13.01.2025 (Annexure P-1) by which the original application filed by the respondents was allowed as well as order dated 07.01.2026 (Annexure P-2) by which, the petitioners had been directed to implement the said order dated 13.01.2025 in letter and spirit.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a direction has been given in the contempt petition to implement the order dated 13.01.2025 in letter and spirit, which could not have been given especially, when the order dated 13.11.2025 (Annexure P-9) was passed in pursuance to the directions given by the Tribunal rejecting the case of the respondents.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and gone through the record with his assistance.



4. It may be noticed that the orders passed by a competent authority of law are to be implemented keeping in view the detailed order passed as to what is the tenor of the order rather than, only considering one portion of the order that liberty is granted to pass an order upon consideration. Once, the entitlement has also been proved, and thereafter an order is passed for consideration means, that the said entitlement proved has also to be taken into consideration while passing the speaking order. The Tribunal, could have proceeded against in Contempt, but, was gracious enough to give liberty to the petitioners to redo what they have done in order to purge the Contempt but still, the petitioners are before this Court challenging the said order.

5. The question in the present case is that the rule on the basis of which consideration was being denied to the respondents for compassionate appointment was already interpreted that the same is not applicable but still, by circumventing the same, the said claim was rejected on the ground of delay, which was not even taken at the initial stage. Hence, denying the benefit on a fresh ground, which was not even presented before the Court, certainly is contrary to the order passed by the Tribunal.

6. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the liberty given by the Tribunal, appropriate fresh order will be passed but reasonable time be given to the petitioners to do so.

7. Let the fresh order in terms of the directions given by the Tribunal be passed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and the Tribunal is requested that in case, any such order is



passed, a lenient view be taken while considering the Contempt Petition.

8. In view of the observations made above, present petition stands dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

30.04.2026
sonia

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes
Whether reportable : No