



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

209

COCP-2210-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.07.2025

Paritosh Singla

...Petitioner

V/s

Suresh and another

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Ms. Manpreet, Advocate for
Mr. Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. P.K. Longia, DAG, Haryana

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The present petition has been preferred under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as the "Contempt Act") alleging disobedience of order dated 05.05.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed in CWP-9638-2023.

2. The petitioner was petitioner No.2 in CWP-9638-2023, in which notice of motion was issued and an interim order was passed in the same terms as in CWP-5772-2023. In CWP-5772-2023, interim order dated 20.03.2023 (Annexure P-2) was passed, wherein it was ordered that during the pendency of the writ petition, no further deduction would be made from the salary of the petitioners.

3. The case set up by the petitioner is that vide Annexures P-3 and P-4, the salary of the petitioner has been re-fixed.

4. In the separate replies submitted by respondents No.1 and 2, it has been submitted that not even a single penny has been deducted from the salary of the petitioner and even the annual increments and Dearness Allowance announced by the State from time to time were added to his pay. A



chart giving the details of the salary right from 09.01.2018 till 01.07.2024 has been given in the said reply. It has further been averred that after the petitioner having superannuated, he is being paid pension.

5. Having gone through the contempt petition and the replies, it emerges that reliance has been placed by the petitioner upon *inter se* communications of the Department and there is absolutely nothing on record to even prima facie suggest that some deductions were made from the salary of the petitioner.

6. That apart, a categorical averment has been made in the reply that not even a single penny has been deducted from the salary of the petitioner from the date of the order dated 05.05.2023 till his retirement on 31.10.2024. Still further, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is still pending and final decision is yet to be arrived at.

7. That being so, I find the instant contempt petition to be misconceived and the same is accordingly dismissed.

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

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

July 07, 2025

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No