

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

**C.O.C.P. No.3124 of 2016
Date of Decision: 08.05.2017**

M/s S & D Fabrics through its Partner

..... Petitioner

Versus

Shri D.P.Reddy, IAS, Principal Secretary to Govt. of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

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

Mr. Anant Kataria, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondents assisted by Mr. Vishav Bandhu,
Deputy Director, Deptt. of Industries and Commerce, Punjab and
Mr. Mahesh Khanna, G.M., Distt. Industries Centre, Ludhiana.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner, through its partner, had filed CWP No.16893 of 2016 seeking directions to the respondent authorities to consider and decide its representation dated 14.03.2016 within a reasonable time. The said petition was disposed of vide order dated 22.08.2016 (**Annexure P-1**) with a direction to the Director, Industries and Commerce, Government of Punjab, Chandigarh to look into the matter, consider the grievance of the petitioner raised vide its representation dated 14.03.2016 and decide the same at an early date, by passing an appropriate order thereon, strictly in accordance with law, but in any case within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, keeping in view the judgment dated 20.05.2011 passed by this Court in CWP No.19007 of 2002 (M/s Balak Gases Oxygen Gas Plant and another Versus State of Punjab and others), which was stated

to have been upheld up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Since the needful was not done, hence the present contempt petition.

At the time of hearing, learned State Counsel for the respondents has filed copy of speaking order dated 02.03.2017, which is taken on record. Copy of the same has been furnished to learned opposite Counsel. He submits that in terms of the said speaking order dated 02.03.2017, the aforesaid directions passed by this Court stand complied with. This fact is not disputed by learned opposite Counsel.

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

Accordingly, the present contempt petition stands dismissed as infructuous. However, if there is still any grievance, the petitioner is at liberty to revive the present contempt petition.

May 08, 2017

Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No