



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

106

COCP-1497-2025

Date of decision : 25.03.2025

**Meena Prabhakar****..... Petitioner**

**versus**

**Dr. K.P. Singh, Regional Provident Fund Commissioner,  
Chandigarh and another**

**..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)**

1. Petitioner alleges willful disobedience of the order dated 05.11.2024. The operative part of the order reads as under:-

“5. On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajesh Hooda, Advocate pointed out that Management during 2001-04 had deposited 10% of salary instead of mandatory requirement of 12% in the Provident Fund. The School Management and petitioners are bound to deposit differential amount along with interest. There are further objections with respect to sudden increase in the salary of the petitioners prior to their retirement. The petitioners are bound to explain the reason of sudden increase in the salary.

6. The petitioners submit that they would cure/remove all the defects which have been pointed out by the respondents in the impugned notices as well as reply to writ petitions. The respondents may be directed to quantify differential amount along with interest so that petitioners may do the needful.

7. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petitions stand disposed of with a direction to respondent to quantify amount payable by petitioners/Management with respect to 2001-04. The said exercise would be completed within 6



weeks from today. The petitioners shall deposit differential amount along with interest within 4 weeks thereafter. The petitioners shall further clarify all the queries which are pointed out in the impugned notices/orders and reply to writ petitions. The Management/College shall also co-operate with the Authorities and submit available record. The benefit available to petitioners would not be denied on account of any lapse on the part of Management/College.”

2. On being asked as to whether the petitioners have offered the explanation with respect to sudden increase in the salary as directed by the Writ Court, counsel submits that the same has to be submitted after quantification of the differential amount. However, there is no such prioritization directed in the order. Since the petitioners themselves are deficient in complying with the order, this Court does not find any reason to interfere in the present petition and the same is ordered to be dismissed.

3. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to approach this Court in case the order passed by Writ Court remains uncomplied even after petitioner has performed his part as directed in order dated 05.11.2024.

**(PANKAJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.03.2025**

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No