



COCP-3151-2024

-1-

230

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

COCP-3151-2024

Date of decision: 08.08.2025

MADAN LAL AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

RAJA SEKHAR VUNDRU AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Raman B. Garg, Advocate with
Mr. Mayank Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ram Karan Singh, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Arnav Goel, Advocate
for respondent No.2-HSAMB.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 30.10.2023 (Annexure P-1), passed by this Court in CWP-21860-2010. Relevant paragraphs whereof are extracted hereinafter.

“xxx

4. Be that as it may, in any case, admittedly the details of cadre strength is not available with the respondents and has also not been considered in the right earnest, while passing the speaking order. In fact, the whole record ought to have been examined before passing the order dated 30.08.2010 (Annexure P-10), which was in pursuance to the directions passed by this Court vide order dated 19.05.2010 in CWP-9306-2010, the issue in hand had been decided in a very casual manner, despite recording that from the record it is evident that method of recruitment is that 80 % of the posts are to be filled by direct



recruitment, whereas 20 % posts are to be filled by promotion from the 4th class employees. Even the employees in the promotional quota has been admitted to be exceeded due to modification of eligibility grade for promotion by the Board in the year 1989 on account of promotion of Class-IV employees of Marketing Committees as Clerk/Arrival Recorder/Care Take/Storekeeper provided that they passed the typing test with the requisite standard.

5. Though, the observations made in the order passed by the Chief Administrator, which is under challenge before this Court, even the legal position is not discussed properly. It may be a case, where correct picture of the cadre strength and the rules might not have been informed to the Courts at that stage and in any case, the service condition of an employee, who is regulated by specific Service Rules framed for the said purpose, are to be strictly adhered to within those parameters, the authorities ought to have been examined the case thoroughly on the basis of record to examine the cadre strength, number of posts for the promotees as well as the direct quota as per the ratio provided in the Service Rules, which is totally absent in this case and as such the order dated 30.08.2010 (Annexure 10) is actually cryptic and not justifiable.

6. At this stage, Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate for respondent No.2, who submits that the respondent-Board will decide the case afresh, after considering the record and the observations made herein after strictly adhering to Rules governing the service condition in the said cadre, as per prescribed quota.

6. In the light of above, order dated 30.08.2010 (Annexure P-10) is set aside.

7. Respondent No. 2 is directed to decide the case afresh within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

xxx”

2. Learned State counsel contends that in compliance of order dated 30.10.2023, passed by this Court in CWP-21860-2010 and order dated 22.07.2025 passed in the instant contempt petition, speaking order dated 05.08.2025 has been passed. Copy of the same has been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioners and also placed on record. This fact is not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

3. A perusal of the speaking order dated 05.08.2025 passed by respondents shows that order dated 30.10.2023, passed by this Court in



COCP-3151-2024

-3-

CWP-21860-2010, and order dated 22.07.2025 passed in the instant contempt petition have been complied with.

4. In view of the above, contempt is purged and rule is discharged.

08.08.2025

Ithlesh

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE**

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