



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COCPC-3610-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 24.02.2026

Shamsher Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Birender Singh Laura and another

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. K.S. Khehar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Anuj Garg, DAG, Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

Affidavits of Dr. Ranjit Singh Jadon, Deputy Director, Animal Husbandry & Dairying, Panchkula and Dr. Sudesh Kumar, Officer-in-charge, Pet Animal Medical Centre (AH&D), Panchkula, filed in the Registry, are taken on record.

2. The instant contempt petition, instituted under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, alleges willful disobedience of the order dated 21.09.2023 (Annexure P-2), passed in CWP-27768-2017:-

“13. Keeping in view the settled principle of law noticed hereinbefore, as in the present case, the salary of the petitioners were reduced without giving any opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, the-said-action of the respondents cannot be sustained. Hence, the order dated 02.05.2017 is set aside and the respondents are directed to reinstate the petitioners in service forthwith.

14. At this stage, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the department be given a chance to pass an appropriate order in accordance with law.



15. As per the settled principle of law, in case, any order which is being set aside on technicality, the department needs to be given a chance to rectify-the. said mistake to pass a fresh order in accordance with law. Hence, the respondents are given appropriate liberty to pass a fresh order in accordance with law.

16. With regard to the consequential benefits for the period when the petitioners remained out, the same will depend on the fresh orders passed by the respondents.”

3. Concededly, the petitioners have been reinstated, but the grievance they have is that the reinstatement was made after a period of five months, though the petitioners were required to be reinstated forthwith.

4. Learned State counsel has referred to the affidavit(s) mentioned above and has submitted that there was no willful disobedience of the directions issued by the Court, and that there was only some procedural delay.

5. Having considered the matter, this Court does not find any willful disobedience of the directions issued by the writ Court, though reinstatement ought to have been made forthwith. However, since no willful disobedience is found, no further orders are required to be passed. Accordingly, the instant contempt petition stands dismissed.

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

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026

Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No