



2026:PHHC:060411

COC-1763-2026

2026:PHHC:060411



1

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

111

**COC-1763-2026
Date of decision : 20.04.2026**

Shanta Talwar

..... Petitioner

versus

Pankaj Aggarwal and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Panwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner claims alleges willful disobedience of the order dated 11.03.2019. The operative part thereof reads as under:-

“xx xx xx

6. The aftermath of the litigation is that the petitioners and other similarly situated employees who fall within top 20% of the respective cadres become entitled to the running pay scale of ₹13500-17250 w.e.f. January 01, 1996. The rate of interest on arrears due will be applicable as directed in *State of Haryana and others v. S.P. Sood* i.e. at the rate of 8% per annum till payment. The monetary entitlements shall be computed and paid to the petitioners within five months from today and a status report on actual disbursements be submitted before the Registrar General of this Court for perusal. The petitioners are also held entitled to all other consequential benefits as may arise out of the judgment covering the case.

7. With the above observations and directions, the petitions stand disposed of.”



COCP-1763-2026

2026:PHHC:060411



2026:PHHC:060411

2

2. It is evident that the judgment is not the judgment in rem, but the judgment in personam. The directions were issued qua petitioners in a said writ petition.

3. In view thereof, this Court finds that no ground is made out for invoking contempt jurisdiction under Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1972.

4. The petition is totally misconceived. The same is ordered to be dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

20.04.2026

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No