



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

COCP-2813-2025

Date of decision : 30.07.2025

Rajneesh

... Petitioner

Versus

Govind Mohan and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Vikas Chatrath, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Anita Balyan, Advocate
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a contempt petition under Article 215 of Constitution of India read with Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for initiating and punishing the respondent for willfully, deliberately, knowingly and intentionally disobeying the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in CWP-5793-2024 titled as "Rajneesh vs. Union of India and others" decided on 22.01.2025.

2. Learned State counsel has submitted that in pursuance of the order dated 22.01.2025, the petitioner has been appointed vide appointment letter dated 10.07.2025. A copy of which has been given to the Court during



the course of trial and is taken on record as Mark A.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that since the compliance order has not been passed within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of the order dated 22.01.2025, thus, the petitioner is also entitled to salary for the time for which delay has been caused in passing the order dated 10.07.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, has submitted that against the order dated 22.01.2025, they had filed an appeal which was dismissed on 21.05.2025 and within two months from the passing of the said order dated 21.05.2025, the order dated 10.07.2025 has been passed. It is submitted that order dated 22.01.2025 would show that it has been specifically observed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court that the petitioner is not entitled to the salary for the abovesaid period and has submitted that at any rate, there is no specific direction given in the order dated 22.01.2025 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court with respect to the claim now being raised by the petitioner. It is further submitted that there is nothing on record to show as to when the certified copy of the order was received by the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in view of the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition be disposed of but liberty be granted to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings for redressal of his grievance.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with



the aforesaid liberty.

7. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits or maintainability of any such proceeding which the petitioner proposes to initiate and in case any such proceeding is initiated, the competent Court would decide the same independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

July 30, 2025.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No