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## HC sets deadline for PGIMS Director's reply

Tribune News Service
CHANDIGARH, JANUARX 7
Just over a fortnight after Dr Rohtash Yadav, Director, Pt Bhagwat Dayal Sharma Post Graduate Institute of Medical Sciences (PGINIS), and another respondent were summoned to "show cause why order of punishment should not be passed against them", the Punjab and Haryana High Court on Monday set a fourweek deadline for them to file a detailed reply.
The order by Justice Nirmaljit Kaur came after the two appeared before the Bench. Fixing the case for the second week of March, Justice Nirmaljit Kaur also granted the respondents exemption from personal appearance before the Bench till further orders.
The direction came on a petition alleging contempt of court filed by Dr Amit Mann against Dr Yadav and another respondent. The Bench was told the petitioner's suspension order dated May 11, 2018, was stayed by the court in June last year and he was reinstated soon after in pursuance to the order. But the petitioner was forced to file the contempt petition as the respondent once again passed suspension order in November 2018 against the petitioner on the same allegations and same charge.
Claiming the second order had no relevance to the earlier suspension stayed by the High Court, Dr Yadav alleged the petitioner was a habitual offender. His services were placed under suspension once again in view of the National Human Rights Commission report dated March 21, 2018, allegedly received by the respondent on November 16, 2018, from the government. The counsel for the respondents argued that

## The case

The petitioner DrAmit Mann told the Bench that his suspension order dated May 11, 2018, was stayed by the court in June last year and he was reinstated soon after in pursuance to the order. But the respondent, Dr Rohtash Yadav, once again passed suspension order in November 2018 against the petitioner on the same allegations and same charge.
the order of stay was not on merits, but on account of technical reasons. The second suspension order was passed on another ground that the petitioner had gone to a foreign country during suspension period without taking permission.
Justice Nirmaljit Kaur had then asserted counsel for the respondent admitted that the charges against the petitioner as per the NHRC report were the same as already pending before the Vigilance Bureau. The charges related to indulgence in private practice, which was also the subjectmatter of inquiry prior to the staying of suspension order. The allegations were stated to be a part of the inquiry. Moreover, the present order of suspension did not mention anything about the petitioner having proceeded abroad. Justice Nirmaljit Kaur had said the court was already seized of the allegations and the suspension order was stayed after examining it. The NHRC report was dated March 21, 2018, whereas the court stayed the suspension order on June 4, 2018. "The court is further shocked to hear the order being defended, which on the face of it has been passed to circumvent the earlier order of suspension," Justice Nirmaljit Kaur had asserted.

