

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

COCP no.1147of 2015(O&M)

Date of Decision :21.09.2015

Vijay Kumar

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Sh.Vijay Kumar Dev and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

Present : Mr.Aman Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Sr. Advocate with

Mr. Vikram Vir Sharda, Advocate for respondents – UT, Chd.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

It is not disputed that plot has been offered to the petitioner but at the prevalent rates which learned counsel for the petitioner states is erroneous as the Division Bench has specifically held that the rights of the petitioner have crystalized in view of the order passed in CWP no. 6957 of 1998. The order is not on record. In any eventuality the writ Court while disposing of the writ petition had clearly mandated that the possession to be delivered to the petitioner subject to making payments in accordance as per schedule given by UT, Chandigarh. The respondents have placed an interpretation on concluding portion of the order to mean payment as per the prevailing schedule.

If that be so then the respondents cannot be held guilty of contempt

for placing an interpretation of an order which is possible.

The contempt petition is therefore, disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to seek his remedies of having a clarification from the writ Court, if so advised.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he will like to move an application. If the same is moved within one week from today, the period prescribed for deposit of the amount by the respondents shall stand extended upto to that date.

September 21, 2015
rekha

(Mahesh Grover)
Judge