IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

COCP-2340-2016
Date of decision: 13.07.2017

Ram Krishan Sharma **...Petitioner**

V/s.

Injeti Srinivas **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY.

Present: Mr. Satish Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Chander Goyal, Advocate
for the respondent.

****

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Vide order dated 01.02.2016 passed in CWP No. 8622 of 2004, order dated 21.08.2000 passed by the Director General, Sports Authority of India has been upheld and order dated 25.01.2003 (Annexure A-16) passed by the Vice Chairman, Sports Authority of India has been set aside. It has also been held in the writ petition that petitioner will be entitled to service benefits in terms of order dated 21.08.2000.

Learned counsel for the respondent submits that all benefits have been granted to petitioner by considering order dated 21.08.2000 whereas learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is entitled for other benefits as well, as only the notional benefits have been granted.

No case of contempt is made out against the respondent.

Disposed of accordingly.

Divyanshi
2017.07.18 12:05
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh

However, the petitioner is at liberty to make representation to the respondent-Authority within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order and in case any such representation is made, respondent is directed to consider the same and take necessary action in accordance with law. In case the petitioner is still aggrieved, he is at liberty to challenge the same.

July 13, 2017 **(DAYA CHAUDHARY)**
Divyanshi **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : **Yes/No**

Whether reportable : **Yes/No**

Divyanshi
2017.07.18 12:05
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh