

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

**EA No.25 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : October 27, 2016**

Rajinder Kumar **..... Applicant**

Versus

State of Punjab and others **..... Respondents**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr. Aalok Jain, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Rohit Sood, Advocate for respondent Nos.3 and 4.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

It comes out that CWP No.3195 of 2007 was allowed vide order dated 22.05.2008, in terms of CWP No.3583 of 2007 titled as “K.C. Sharma vs State of Punjab and others”, decided on 17.12.2007. It also comes out that thereafter, the applicant filed three contempt petitions bearing COCP No.1897 of 2008, decided on 28.08.2009, COCP No.2156 of 2008, decided on 10.12.2009 and COCP NO.2007 of 2009, decided on 16.11.2009. All the said contempt petitions have been disposed of.

Now, the present execution application has been filed under Order 21, Rule 10 read with Section 151 CPC for execution of the order passed by this Court on 22.05.2008 in CWP No.3195 of 2007.

I am of the view that the provisions of Order 21 CPC do not applied to the order passed in the civil writ petition. The applicant has already availed the remedy of contempt petition thrice. Therefore, the present application is nothing but the misuse of process of court.

As such, the present execution application is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

October 27, 2016

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No