

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

**C.O.C.P. No. 174 of 2016
Date of Decision:- 16.02.2017**

Jeet Ram ...Petitioner

vs.

Rakesh Manocha and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner has been promoted from the date his juniors have been promoted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that consequential benefits have not been granted to the petitioner, whereas, the case of the petitioner was ordered to be considered in view of judgments passed in R.S.A. No. 1034 of 1993 titled as **Dharam Pal vs. State of Haryana and others**, decided on 1.4.2014 and CWP No. 10783 of 1997 titled as **Chhatar Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others**, decided on 12.3.1998.

Keeping in view the submission made by learned counsel for the respondent-State that the petitioner has been promoted from the date his juniors have been promoted, the present contempt petition is disposed of. In case, the consequential benefits have not been granted to the petitioner at par with Dharam Pal and Chhatar Singh, as mentioned in order dated

18.2.2015, the same be granted within a period of one month from the date of receipt of copy of the order.

In case the petitioner is still aggrieved in any manner, he is at liberty to make representation and same shall be considered by the respondents in view of judgment passed in **Dharam Pal's case (supra) and Chhatar Singh's case (supra)**.

Contempt petition stands disposed of.

February 16, 2017
poonam

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

Yes