



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(207)

COCP No.1309 of 2021

Date of Decision: 03.09.2025

Veenu Mittal @ Veenu Garg

...Petitioner

VS

Babita Verma and another

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate &
Mr. Vinayak Atre, Advocate for
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anuj Garg, D.A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Kundu, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

By way of the instant contempt petition, the petitioner alleges willful disobedience of order dated 05.02.2020 (Annexure P-1) passed in **CWP No.3215 of 2020** titled as **Kalyan Singh Bharat and others Vs. State of Haryana and others.**

2. The aforesaid writ petition in which the petitioner was at serial No.291 came up for hearing on 05.02.2020 when notice of motion was issued and an interim order as passed in CWP No.6192 of 2019, was passed.

3. Order dated 07.03.2019 (Annexure P-2) had been passed in CWP No.6192 of 2019 wherein it was ordered that the petitioner therein would continue to work as per the directions given in **CWP No.26077 of 2018** titled as **Mamta Rani and others Vs. State of Haryana and others.**

4. The directions in CWP No.26077 of 2018 had been passed vide order dated 09.10.2018(Annexure P-3):-

“Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to allow the petitioners to work till regular appoints are made and the petitioners shall not be replaced on the basis of transfer of regular employee. However, It is further made clear that if some new regular candidate joins, the petitioners can be relieved, as per Menka and others v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 05.05.2016 and further the respondents will consider the retention of the petitioner as per the guidelines issued on 13.07.2018 (Annexure P-4). This exercise shall be completed within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.”

5. Notice in the instant contempt petition was issued on 08.07.2021. On 03.10.2023, learned State counsel submitted that the petitioner was continuing to work as an Extension Lecturer and at that time there was no violation of the order (Annexure P-1).

6. That being so, learned counsel for the petitioner sought some time to argue the case.

7. Thereafter, on 21.05.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Counsel for respondent No.2 has submitted that proposition of law, as propounded in CWP-26077-2018, titled as 'Mamta Rani and others vs. State of Haryana and others', has already been reversed by the Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 15.12.2022 passed in LPA-1257- 2019.

Counsel for the petitioner seeks time to address the arguments.

Adjourned to 29.08.2024.

However, it is clarified that no further adjournment shall be granted.”

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to controvert the factual position that he is still working and that the decision in CWP No.26077 of 2028 has been reversed by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 15.12.2022 passed in LPA No.1257 of 2019.

9. That being so, under no circumstances can it be said that there has been any violation of the order (Annexure P-1) by the respondents.

The contempt petition is, therefore, found to be devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

**(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE**

September 03, 2025
Rekha

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