

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****COCP-3391-2025 (O&M)****Date of Decision : 20.08.2025**

Raksha Devi alias Renu

... Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar, IAS, Principal Secretary and Another

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**

Present : Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG Punjab.

**ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)**

1. This is a petition under Section 12 read with Section 14 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for violation of the order dated 04.04.2024 passed in CWP-23537-2017.

2. On 17.07.2025 the following order was passed :

*“Issue notice to the respondents to show cause as to why proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 be not initiated against them for non-compliance of order dated 04.04.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-23537-2017.*

*Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG Punjab puts in appearance on behalf of the respondents. He has pointed out that the dispute herein pertains to compassionate appointment and two separate claims were filed - one by Raksha Devi @*

*Renu (the petitioner herein) and another by the children of the first wife of the deceased. The children from the first wife had also preferred a contempt petition for violation of the order not granting them compassionate appointment and in the said contempt petition a statement was made that the letter for appointment of Raksha Devi @ Renu (the petitioner herein) was being withdrawn. Learned counsel for the respondent seeks some time to place on record the affidavit. On his request, adjourned to 30.07.2025.”*

3. Today the learned State counsel has filed a reply by way of affidavit of Damandeep Singh Gill, Executive Engineer, Ropar Head Works Division, Roopnagar wherein the same stand has been reiterated. The reply is taken on record. Registry to scan the same and tag at the appropriate place.

4. In view of the reply filed by the learned State counsel, no further orders are required to be passed in the present case and the same is disposed off. Rule stands discharged. Needless to say, the petitioner would always be at liberty to avail her remedies as available in law. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

20.08.2025  
jk

( ALKA SARIN )  
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking  
Whether reportable: YES/NO