



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

213

COCP-2338-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.09.2025

Usha Yadav

...Petitioner

V/s

Anand Mohan Sharan and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Arshad Ali, Advocate, for
Ms. Amrita Nagpal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Anuj Garg, DAG, Haryana

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The instant petition, preferred under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as the "1971 Act") alleges willful disobedience of order dated 05.02.2020 (Annexure P-1) passed in CWP-3215-2020.

2. The petitioner (Usha Yadav) is working as an extension Lecturer in Government College, Kanina in the subject of Political Science.

3. She along with others instituted CWP-3215-2020 titled as Kalyan Singh Bharat and others V/s State of Haryana and others, in which, order dated 05.02.2020 was passed:-

"Notice of motion for 20.02.2020.

To be heard along with CWP-6192-2019.

Interim order in the same terms."

4. The order dated 07.03.2019 in CWP-6192-2019 was as under:-

"In the meantime, petitioners shall continue to work as per directions given by this Court in CWP-26077-2018 Mamta Rani V/s State of Haryana."

5. Further, order dated 09.10.2018 in CWP-26077-2018 titled as Mamta Rani V/s State of Haryana was as under:-



“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/s 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.”

6. The grievance of the petitioner is that vide order dated 27.07.2021 (Annexure P-4), one Assistant Professor was transferred to Kanina, whereafter, with a view to circumvent the order passed by the writ Court, the salary of the petitioner has been reduced, though in purported compliance of the order passed by the writ Court, she has not been removed from service. It is the grievance of the petitioner that that this amounts to disobedience of the orders.

7. In the reply, reliance has been placed upon policy dated 04.03.2020 and Clauses 8 and 10 whereof read as under:-

“(8) The eligible extension lecturers shall be paid @ 57,70/- per months w.e.f. 27.06.2019 (on the principal of equal work equal pay) and no allowances are to be paid. They shall be given teaching workload as per State Govt. norms. Further, they shall also perform all additional duties (at par with regular Assistant/Associate Professor). However, duties involving financial responsibilities shall not be allotted to them.

(9) xxx xxx xxx

(10) Whenever, an extension lecture is engaged and still working as being protected by the orders of Hon’ble High Court and there is less workload as per stipulated norms they will be paid Rs.35,400/- per month.”

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the act of transferring a regular employee to Kanina despite two extension Lecturers already working was done deliberately to reduce the work-load and then to reduce the salary of the petitioner by taking shield of the policy dated 04.03.2020.



9. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that the action has been taken strictly as per policy dated 04.03.2020. He further submits that CWP-26077-2018 was dismissed but LPA-1121-2019 against the said order was allowed on 03.12.2020. Learned State counsel has produced a copy of the said order. He further submits that in view of the same, the instant contempt petition deserves to be dismissed.

10. Controverting the same, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the LPA stands allowed, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is still pending adjudication.

11. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

12. Concededly, the petitioner is still working as an extension Lecturer as had been directed by way of the interim order passed in favour of the petitioner. However, the salary has been reduced in terms of Clause 10 of policy dated 04.03.2020 as has been stated in the reply. In the considered opinion of this Court, no case of willful disobedience is, therefore, made out and if the petitioner has any grievance against the reduction of salary, she would be free, if so advised, to avail all such remedies as shall be admissible in law.

13. That being so, no further orders are required to be passed by this Court.

14. The contempt petition is accordingly disposed of. Rule stands discharged.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

September 08, 2025

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No