

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

COCP No.835 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 09.11.2017

Shakuntla Yadav and another

.....Petitioner

Versus

Hardeep Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Ashish Chopra, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

Mr. P. S. Chauhan, Advocate for respondent No.4.

* * *

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Vide order dated 29.05.2015 passed by the Division Bench, the claim of the petitioners was to be considered by 30.12.2015 but when the compliance was not made, the petitioners had to file the contempt petition, wherein notice of motion was issued on 08.04.2016. Subsequently, after filing of the reply an affidavit was also filed to explain as to why action was not taken. Admittedly, there is delay in compliance of the order and the reason given that the petitioners were informed to appear before the competent authority is not convincing, whereas as per case of the petitioners, no intimation was sent. Subsequently, one of the petitioners appeared on 06.01.2016. Petitioners had to avail the remedy in the third round of litigation. Not only delay of one year has occurred but

inconvenience has also been caused. Petitioners had to incur the expenses on the litigation. Accordingly, cost of ₹50,000/- in the form of litigation charges is imposed upon the respondents, who were instrumental in causing the delay to be paid to the petitioners by way of bank draft within a period of one month from their own pocket. The amount of cost is to be shared equally by the petitioners.

Disposed of.

09.11.2017

sunil yadav

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No