



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

Sr. No.106-A

**COCP No.535 of 2004 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.05.2025**

Rajendri Kumari

.... Petitioner

Versus

J.S. Kadyan, serving as Registrar, Kurukshetra University

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Jangjit Singh Dahiya, Advocate, for the petitioner
(through video conferencing).

Mr. A.S. Virk, Advocate, for the University.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed seeking punishment for the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, for wilful disobedience of the order dated 19.03.2004, Annexure P-1, passed by this Court, which reads as under:

Notice of motion for 23.7.2004.

To be heard with CWP No.7546 of 2003.

In the meantime, termination of the services of the petitioner shall remain stayed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that despite the said interim order, the petitioner was relieved from service with effect from 24.03.2004 vide letter of even date, Annexure P-3. This was despite the fact that a copy of the order was sent to the respondent vide letter dated 22.03.2004, Annexure P-2.

3. Mr. Virk, learned counsel appearing for the University in the connected matter, CWP No.4857 of 2004, contends that it being an old matter, he has taken instructions from the University regarding the facts of



the case and is assisting the Court on that basis. He contends that the petitioner was engaged in the University College of Education on contract basis for eighty-nine days, vide letter dated 02.01.2004, and on expiry of the contract she automatically stood relieved from service on 21.03.2004 in terms of the agreement signed by her with the University, dated 27.09.2003, Annexure R-1/1. The relieving letter, dated 24.03.2004, was not issued by the respondent, who was at the relevant time working as Registrar. Instead, it was issued by the College Principal on the basis of a letter bearing no. ET-2/04/3472 dated 23.03.2004, Annexure R-1/2, which did not concern the petitioner herein; it was issued for relieving five other part-time/contract teachers, and not the petitioner. The reply filed on behalf of the respondent, dated 22.10.2004, also states that copy of interim order, dated 19.03.2004, was dispatched by this Court on 22.03.2004 and received by him only on 25.03.2004, and by that time the petitioner already stood automatically relieved from engagement. Therefore, there is no intentional violation of the order passed by this Court.

4. These facts have not been controverted by the petitioner by filing any counter-affidavit.

5. In view thereof, it cannot be said that the interim order, dated 19.03.2004, was intentionally and wilfully violated by the respondent. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

15.05.2025

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