

C.O.C.P. No. 1144 of 2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.O.C.P. No. 1144 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION:09.08.2017

R.P. Garg (Retd.)

.....Petitioner

Versus

M.K.V. Ramarao

.....Respondent

BEFORE:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Girdhar, Advocate
for the respondent.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

Vide order dated 24.4.2014, CWP No. 12395 of 1997 filed by the petitioner was disposed of with a direction to consider the case of the petitioner in view of the directions issued in C.W.P. No. 16330 of 2005 on 9.1.2014 titled as **Parveen Arora and others Vs. Haryana Power Generation Corporation Ltd. and others** within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. When said order was not complied with, the petitioner had to file the present contempt petition. The claim of the petitioner was not considered as per directions issued by this Court. Subsequently, the claim of the petitioner has been rejected that too after a long delay.

Learned counsel for the respondent has made all efforts to

justify the delay. He submits that an application was also moved for extension of period of two weeks, which was allowed.

Even in case the period was extended for two weeks, the order passed by the writ Court was to be complied with within a period of four and a half months but still the order has not been complied with within the specified period. No doubt, vide order dated 24.4.2017, only direction was issued to consider the claim of the petitioner but admittedly delay has occurred.

The present petition is accordingly disposed of.

The petitioner is at liberty to challenge the order in case he is aggrieved by the same.

However, for causing delay cost of ₹20,000/- is imposed upon the respondent to be paid to the LRs of deceased-petitioner by way of draft within a period of one month.

August 09, 2017
pooja

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No