

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COCF No. 1539 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.01.2015.

Kulbir Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Sarvesh Kaushal & others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Rahul Dev Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, A.A.G., Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

The instant contempt petition has been filed asserting non-compliance of the order dated 21.9.2012, passed by the Writ Court while disposing of CWP No.18798 of 2012.

Suffice it to observe that the petitioner claims himself to be the son of an oustee pertaining to the Ranjeet Sagar Dam. In the writ petition a claim had been raised seeking employment under a Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy.

Learned State counsel has filed in Court today a reply by way of affidavit of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Works, Punjab, Ranjeet Sagar Dam Project, Tehsil & District Pathankot along with documents at Annexures R-1 to R-4. The reply is taken on record and a complete copy has been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Appended along with the reply at Annexure R-3 is an order dated 14.1.2015, passed by the Chief Engineer in terms of which the claim of the petitioner seeking an employment avenue has been rejected on the basis that the land acquired was a joint land holding and one member of

such joint family namely Balwant Singh son of Roshan Singh, who has been described as nephew of the petitioner has already been provided employment as Class-IV employee vide letter dated 4.7.2012.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the authorities have wrongfully held the land holding to be joint and rather separate amounts of compensation had been paid.

Be that as it may, the direction issued by the Writ Court was to take a final decision on the representation/legal notice that had been served by the petitioner.

In the light of the speaking order dated 14.1.2015 at Annexure R-3 having been passed, nothing would survive in the instant contempt petition. The same is accordingly disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

Rule discharged.

It would, however, be open for the petitioner to raise a challenge to the order dated 14.1.2015, if, so advised and strictly in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

January 27, 2015.

lucky