

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

COCN No. 1031 of 2016

Date of Decision: 09 June, 2016

SATBIR SINGH AND ORS

-PETITIONERS

VS

SUKHMINDER SINGH MANN AND ORS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

**Present: Mr. Surender Gaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.**

Mr. B.M. Vinayak, DAG, Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Non-compliance of order dated 23.12.2015 has been alleged in this contempt petition. While not entertaining CWP No.26889 of 2015, permission was granted to the petitioner to withdraw the writ petition and to file a representation before the concerned authorities. In the event of filing such representation, the concerned authorities were obligated to decide the same in accordance with law preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

There is no averment in the petition as well as in the representation that second part of the order was complied with by the petitioner inasmuch as that the certified copy of the order was made available to the concerned authorities. Apparently, on 08.01.2016, representation was received by the authorities and the same was referred to the local police to inquire. On inquiry, the police found that no harassment was caused to the petitioner. The

Deputy Superintendent of Police vide endorsement dated 10.02.2016 reported that he has already instructed officer- in-charge of Police Station City Kotkapura to issue directions to his subordinate Officials/Investigating Officer not to cause any harassment to anyone who runs the business of Lottery under the Lottery Regulation Act. No further action was called for at the instance of the authorities and the matter was consigned.

In terms of reply filed by the respondents, it has been informed that police has not harassed anyone who is doing business of Lottery in accordance with Lottery Regulation Act, 1998, however, violators of rules will be dealt with strictly.

In view of aforesaid observations, I am of the view that no contempt is made out against the respondents. Rule is accordingly discharged.

Dismissed.

09.06.2016*jyoti Y.***(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**