

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

**C.O.C.P. No.2747 of 2016
Date of Decision: 08.02.2017**

Shishpal Chander

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Sarvesh Kaushal, IAS, Principal Secretary,
Department of Irrigation, Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Girdhar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondents/contemnors.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner had filed CWP No.19531 of 2016 seeking directions to the respondents to release the due payments qua the works of constructing Escape Channels, executed by the petitioner. The said petition was disposed of vide order dated 21.09.2016 (**Annexure P-1**) with a direction to respondent No.4 therein, Executive Engineer, Bathinda Canal Division, Bathinda, to look into the matter, consider the grievance of the petitioner, raised vide his legal notice dated 01.09.2016 and decide the same by passing an appropriate order in accordance with law within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of the order and it was further directed that if, after due consideration of the matter, respondent No.4 comes to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the amount being sought to be released, the same shall be released in favour of the petitioner, without any further loss of time. Since the needful was not done within the stipulated time, hence the present contempt petition.

At the time of hearing, the reply along with speaking order dated 29.11.2016 (**Annexure R/4-1**) and photocopy of Demand Draft (**Annexure R/4-II**), amounting to Rs.10,000/- payable to the petitioner, have been filed in Court, after due compliance of the previous order dated 02.12.2016. The same are taken on record. A copy thereof has been furnished to learned Counsel for the petitioner.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner concedes that the present contempt petition has become infructuous as the total amount due towards execution of the works by the petitioner/contractor has since been paid.

In view of the above, no further action is warranted.

Accordingly, the present contempt petition stands dismissed as infructuous.

February 08, 2017
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>