

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

COCN No.301 of 2016

Date of decision: 11.08.2017

Praveen Kumar

..Petitioner

Versus

Brijender Singh and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. H.N. Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Chauhan, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 3.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondent No.2.

Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate
for M.C. Gurgaon.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 3 submits that respondents No.1 and 3 are not necessary party as the compliance of the order was to be made by M.C.

Admittedly, M.C. was not party in the writ petition as well as in the contempt petition. Subsequently, on oral request, M.C. has been impleaded as party and has put in appearance through counsel. On the last date of hearing, case was adjourned to get instructions regarding the steps taken for vacation of temporary injunction granted by the trial Court in favour of Sh. Lachhi.

Learned counsel appearing for M.C. Gurgaon submits that an application for vacation of stay was moved but the same has been returned

and application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC is still pending.

Since the matter is pending before the trial Court and application for interim order is also fixed for hearing today, no direction can be issued at this stage.

Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of as premature.

However, the petitioner is at liberty to approach M.C. Gurgaon for his grievance by moving representation and in case, any such representation is moved within a period of two weeks, M.C. Gurgaon is directed to take necessary action in accordance with law within a period of one month thereafter.

11.08.2017
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No