



COCp-6236-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. COCP-6236-2025

Inderjit Mahajan

... Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar and another

... Respondents

2.

COCp-6238-2025

Parminder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar and another

... Respondents

3.

COCp-6243-2025

Amarjit Singh Sharma

... Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar and another

... Respondents

4.

COCp-6245-2025

Tarsem Chand

... Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar and another

... Respondents

2026:PHHC:029367



COCp-6236-2025

2

5.

COCp-6256-2025

Amar Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar and another

... Respondents

Date of decision : 24.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr.Sandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This order would dispose of five contempt petitions i.e., COCP-6236-2025, COCP-6238-2025, COCP-6243-2025, COCP-6245-2025 and COCP-6256-2025 as similar issues are involved in all these contempt petitions.

2. On 21.01.2026, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*" Present: Mr.Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.*

Mr.Sandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

*Reply by way of short affidavit filed on behalf of respondent no.1 in
the Court is taken on record.*

*The present set of five writ petitions was disposed of by the Co-
ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 28.07.2025. The relevant portion of
which is reproduced hereinbelow:-*



“14. Keeping in view the totality of the circumstances, the respondents are directed to notionally promote the petitioner(s) as Executive Engineer with effect from the date Gurmeet Singh was promoted i.e. 23.06.2016. The petitioner(s) will not be entitled for any salary for the period of notional promotion as Executive Engineer, the pensionary benefits of the petitioner(s) will be revised by treating them as an Executive Engineer on the date of retirement by notionally calculating the pay which such petitioner(s) would have drawn after the grant of the promotion as Executive Engineer w.e.f. 23.06.2016. The revised pensionary benefits will be admissible to such petitioner(s) by recalculating the last pay drawn in the cadre of Executive Engineer keeping in view the order passed hereinbefore and the difference in the pensionary benefits which the petitioner(s) will get upon being promoted as Executive Engineer from 23.06.2016 including the higher pension after adjusting the amount already paid, will be released in favour of the petitioner(s) within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

15. No further argument was raised.

16. The present writ petitions are allowed in above terms.

17. Civil miscellaneous application pending if any, also stands disposed of.

18. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

July 28, 2025”

A perusal of the above order would show that the order was to be complied with within a period of 4 months. It would be relevant to note that the learned counsel for the State was present and was duly represented when the said order was passed. Since the order was not complied with within a period of 4 months, the present contempt petitions were filed on 16.12.2025.

On 19.12.2025, learned counsel for the State had prayed for adjournment to submit compliance report. The order dated 19.12.2025 is reproduced hereinbelow:-

*“Present: Mr.Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.*

Mr.Sandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

2026:PHHC:029367



COCP-6236-2025

4

Learned State counsel prays for an adjournment to submit compliance report.

Adjourned to 21.01.2026.

To be shown in the urgent list.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of the connected cases.

December 19, 2025”

Instead of complying with the said order, learned counsel for the State has submitted that a review application i.e., RA-CW-29-2026 has been filed on 16.01.2026.

On a query raised by this Court, it has been stated that neither notice has been issued in the said review application much less there being any interim order in favour of the State. Merely filing of the review application and that also after the contempt petition has been filed would not absolve the State from implementing the order.

When this Court was about to proceed against the respondents for non-compliance, learned counsel for the State on instructions from respondent no.2, who is present in Court, has submitted that they would comply with the order dated 28.07.2025 subject to the decision in the review application. It is further submitted that in case the compliance is not done by the next date of hearing, then, an amount of Rs.15,000/- would be paid to every petitioner.

Adjourned to 23.02.2026.

It is made clear that in case due compliance is not done by the next date of hearing, then, apart from further proceedings in the matter, the respondents would also pay Rs.15,000/- to each of the petitioners as litigation expenses.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of the connected cases.

January 21, 2026”

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that in compliance to the said order, a speaking order dated 23.02.2026 has been passed in each of the cases which is taken on record as Mark A (colly). A copy of the said order



has been handed over to the learned counsel for the petitioner(s).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has submitted that a perusal of the order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court dated 28.07.2025 would show that apart from the fact that the petitioner(s) were to be promoted w.e.f. 23.06.2016, the pension of the petitioner(s) was also required to be revised and the pensionary benefits were also to be released in a time bound manner, which have not been released till date.

5. When this Court was about to proceed in the present contempt petitions, learned State counsel, on specific instructions from Gopal Yakhmi, Superintendent, Water Resources Department, Punjab, has submitted that the amount payable on account of leave encashment and pay fixation would be paid to each of the petitioner(s) within a period of 20 days from today. It is further submitted that the amount due on account of revised pension would be paid to each of the petitioner(s) within a period of two months from today and in case the same is not done, then, the respondents would pay an additional amount of Rs.1 lac to each of the petitioner(s).

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has submitted that in view of the same, the present petitions be disposed of but the respondents be bound by the statement made before this Court.

7. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances and the statement made on behalf of the respondents, the present contempt petitions are disposed of. However, the respondents are bound by the statement made before this Court.



8. It is reiterated and clarified that in case the petitioner(s) are required to file an application for revival in view of the respondents having back tracked, then, the amount as undertaken before this Court, would be payable by the respondents in addition to further proceedings in the contempt proceedings.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No