

2025:PHHC:071486



[104] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP-2493-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision : 26.05.2025

Ronak Dahiya ...Petitioner

**versus**

Anurag Rastogi, IAS, Chief Secretary  
to Govt. of Haryana and another ....Respondents

Coram : **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Vikas Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner. (Through V.C.)  
Mr. Suneel Ranga, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)**

[1] By way of the present contempt petition, the petitioner alleges disobedience of Order dated 26.07.2024 passed by the Writ Court in CWP No.17301 of 2024. The order reads as under:-

*"1. Prayer made in the present petition is for directing the respondents to grant retrospective appointment to the petitioner along with other benefits. In para 16 of the petition it has been stated that Instructions dated 05.07.2024 have been issued by the Chief Secretary to grant relief to the petitioners in CWP No.14591 of 2023 and the same is thus required to be extended to the petitioners as well. A representation dated 13.02.2024 (Annexure P7) is already pending with the authorities which has not yet evoked any response as stated in para 15.*

*2. In view of the above and without commenting on the merits of the case, it would be in the interest of justice, this petition is hereby disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation dated 13.02.2024 expeditiously, in accordance with law."*

[2] Today, learned State Counsel has produced copy of Order dated 23.05.2025 to show that the order stands complied with.



[3] Evidently, the contempt petition was filed on 16.05.2025 with an advance copy served upon the respondents. It is thereafter only that Order dated 23.05.2025 has been passed almost after 10 months from the date of the order passed by the Writ Court. Even though, learned State counsel claims that the order stands complied with. However, it is only after the petitioner, who was constrained to approach this Court by way of contempt petition that the order could be complied with. For 10 months, the respondents remained in slumbers.

[4] In view of the above, this Court finds that the petitioner is entitled for costs of the present *lis*. Resultantly, the present petition is ***disposed off***. However, respondent No.2 is saddled with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be paid to the petitioner within a period of 04 weeks. The costs shall be recovered from the personal pay of respondent No.2.

[5] All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands ***disposed off***.

**(PANKAJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

26.05.2025  
'R. Sharma'

*Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*