

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

**COCF No.957 of 2016 in
CWP No.3086 of 2015**

Date of decision: 28.9.2016

Dr.Ramjas Yadav

.....petitioner

Versus

P.Raghvender Rao and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr.S.K.Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi, Advocate and
Mr.Pravindra Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the respondents.

Raj Mohan Singh, J.(oral)

In this petition, petitioner seeks to initiate proceedings under Contempt of Courts Act against the respondents for committing wilful contempt of order dated 23.12.2015 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.3086 of 2015 titled Dr.Ramjas Yadav vs. P.Raghvender Rao and others. The operative part of the aforesaid order reads as under:-

“8. In view of the reasons recorded above, writ petition is allowed. Impugned orders are set aside.

The petitioner is held entitled to the allotment of an alternate plot as per policy dated 15.4.1998 issued by Chief Administrator, HUDA. The pricing of such plot would be as per terms and conditions contained in the policy itself. It is made clear that the benefit of this order would enure to the petitioner only upon deposit of ₹ 82,500/- i.e.15% of the allotment price towards the original plot allotted to him along with interest @ 10% per annum from the date such deposit had become due i.e. 4.1.2001.

9. Petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the benefit arising out of the order was required to be given to the petitioner within a reasonable time from the date of passing of the order. Petitioner issued two notices after the aforesaid order, but needful was not done, rather reply given by the respondents was that they are in the process of filing SLP against the aforesaid order.

A perusal of order dated 23.12.2015 reveals that though the petition was allowed, but specific time was not recorded for compliance thereof. The order was required to be complied with within a reasonable time.

As per reply filed by the respondents in Court today, which is taken on record, the order has been complied with.

Notice has not been issued in the contempt petition so far, but the learned State counsel sought time on 19.8.2016. Be that as it may, since the order has been complied with, no further action is called for.

Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of.

September 28, 2016
anita

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE