

2025:PHHC:092111



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

**COCP-2030-2023 (O&M)  
Decided on:-24.07.2025**

Karma Devi

....Petitioner..

vs.

Sh. Atul Kumar Goel, MD & CEO, PNB  
and another

....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Petitioner in person.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate,  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)**

1. By way of present petition, prayer has been made for initiation of contempt proceedings against respondents for the alleged willful non-compliance of order dated 27.09.2017 passed by the Writ Court. The operative part of the aforesaid order is reproduced hereunder:-

*“26. In view of above facts and circumstances and certain provisions which have not been followed in the inquiry as well as non-consideration of the petitioner's contentions by the disciplinary authority on the Inquiring Officer's report, orders dated 02.08.2008, 11.10.2008 and 30.11.2009 passed by the disciplinary, appellate and reviewing authority (Annexures P/13, P/15 and P/16 respectively) are hereby set aside.*

*27. In the result, writ petition is allowed. In order to avoid needless complications in working out mutual rights and obligations of the parties, writ petitioner shall be treated as*

*having retired from service w.e.f. the date of her superannuation in the normal course. She shall be paid arrears of her salary from the date of retiring her compulsorily w.e.f. 02.08.2008 till date of age of superannuation. If any increments were due to her during the period from 2008 till her superannuation, the same shall be extended and arrears shall be paid to the petitioner. Retiral benefits, if any, like provident fund, gratuity etc., if she is entitled in accordance with law, shall also be calculated and disbursed to her in accordance with regulations/rules, as if no order compulsory retirement was passed against her. The above exercise shall be completed within a period of four months from today.”*

2. The aforesaid order was later assailed by way of LPA No.2379-2017. The operative part thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

*“Not only has the learned Single Judge held that the initiation of the disciplinary authority is vitiated by malafides, respondent No.1 had also stated that in her reply filed to CM-96-LPA-2023 before this Court that she had not worked anywhere during the period 02.08.2008 to 28.02.2014 (Para xix) and this is not refuted by the appellants by any pleading or evidence. Therefore, we hold that respondent No.1 is entitled to full back-wages on the basis of the above decisions w.e.f. 03.02.2008 till 28.02.2014 with interest @6% per annum till the date of payment.”*

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner has already been released her full back-wages along with interest @ 6% per annum.

4. On the contrary, the petitioner appearing in person submits that the interest was to be paid at the compound rate and not as simple interest, however, she has not been able to refer to any rule, regulation or any law on the issue.

5. I have heard the petitioner as well as learned counsel

representing the respondents and gone through the paper book.

6. Considering the fact that the order passed by the LPA Bench clearly stipulates that the petitioner shall be entitled for full back-wages w.e.f. 03.02.2008 till 28.02.2014 with interest @6% per annum till the date of payment; the same undoubtedly has to be treated as grant of simple interest and not compound interest, in the absence of there being any specific stipulation to the said effect in the orders passed by this Court under the substantive proceedings. To support the aforesaid view reference can be made to decision rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of "**Delhi Financial Corporation vs. B.B. Behel**", reported as **1999 AIR (Supreme Court) Pg. 2358**. Relevant portion from para No.12 of the aforementioned judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

*"..... The appellant is also not entitled to claim compound interest on the decretal amount due because it is evident from the order of recovery that the learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh awarded interest at the rate of 17½ percent per annum which can only mean simple interest and not compound interest."*

7. In view thereof, no cause survives in the present petition, as such, the same is disposed of. Rule stands discharged.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

24.07.2025

sonika

**(HARKESH MANUJA)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:  
Whether reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/ No