

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

C.O.C.P. No. 597 of 2014

Date of Decision:- 08.05.2017

M/s GTL Infrastructure Limited

....Petitioner

vs.

Shruti Singh and another

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Sumeet Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Bazaz, Advocate,
for the respondents.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has approached this Court under Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for non-compliance of order dated 12.7.2013 passed in CWP No.13288 of 2013.

As per order dated 12.7.2013, the respondents were directed to decide the representation by passing a speaking order within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order which was supplied to the respondents but no action was taken.

The petitioner filed contempt petition in which notice of motion was issued on 5.3.2014. Thereafter, case was adjourned on various dates and ultimately vide order dated 12.1.2017, it was ordered that in case the order was not complied with within a period of one week, respondent No.2 was to be present in Court on the next date of hearing. The case was not taken up on the date fixed and it was adjourned for 8.5.2017 i.e. today.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that order has been passed on 20.1.2017, whereas, directions were issued not only in writ

petition but in the contempt petition also.

As per order passed in the writ petition, the decision was to be taken on the representation within a period of one month and thereafter as per order dated 12.1.2017, it was to be decided within a period of one week, meaning thereby, the order passed on 12.1.2017 was to be complied with within one week only, failing which, respondent No.2 was directed to be present in Court for non-compliance of order dated 12.1.2017.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that case of the petitioner has been considered as per new policy, whereas, it was to be decided in view of the earlier policy. Learned counsel for the respondents undertakes to decide the claim of the petitioner in view of earlier policy in case he deposits the requisite amount.

Since the compliance of the order has been made, the present contempt petition is disposed of.

In case the petitioner is aggrieved with the order dated 20.1.2017 which has been passed by the respondents, he is at liberty to challenge the same. Since there is delay in compliance of order, costs of ₹ 10,000/- is imposed upon the respondents which is to be paid to the petitioner by way of demand draft within a period of two weeks.

May 08, 2017
poonam

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

No