



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COCP-824-2025

Date of decision : 10.09.2025

Pushpa Rani

... Petitioner

Versus

Amit Khatri and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Rohan Moudgil, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a petition filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India for non-compliance of the order dated 04.11.2024 (Annexure P-19) passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP-22212-2024.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent-State has submitted that in pursuance of the order dated 04.11.2024 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, a speaking order dated 30.01.2025 was passed which has been annexed as Annexure R-1 along with the reply filed in the present petition.

It is further submitted that thereafter, in pursuance of the order passed by



the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the present proceedings, the matter has been re-considered at the level of Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana and the Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana after considering the entire aspect has re-affirmed the order dated 30.01.2025 that the petitioner is not entitled to get the benefit of equal work w.e.f. 01.11.2017. It is submitted that in the order dated 04.11.2024 it was specifically observed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court that the Co-ordinate Bench was not commenting on the merits of the case and the respondents were directed to consider and decide the representations submitted by the petitioner in a time bound manner, which has been done by the respondents-authority.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not satisfied with the order dated 30.01.2025 (Annexure R-1) as well as subsequent order passed and thus, has stated that the present contempt petition be disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the abovesaid orders, in accordance with law.

4. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

September 10, 2025.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No