

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

**COC-721-2014**

**Date of Decision: May 30, 2017**

**Raj Malik & others**

...Petitioners

Versus

**Tarsem Sharma & another**

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI**

Present: Ms. Harpreet Kaur, Advocate for  
Mr. Amit Jain, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Ms. Shubhra Singh, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI, J. (Oral):**

Request for adjournment has been made on behalf of counsel for the petitioners, however, on perusal of the order dated 31.10.2013 passed by this Court in CWP No.23737 of 2013, titled as 'Raj Malik & others Vs. State of Haryana & others', would show that the Court while passing the said order had directed the respondents to consider and decide the legal notice dated 04.10.2013 served by the petitioner, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. The reply which has been filed by the respondents by way of an affidavit indicates that the legal notice stands decided vide order dated 21.10.2014 (Annexure R-1).

In the considered view of this Court, the order passed by this Court stands duly complied with. In case the petitioners are aggrieved of the order dated 21.10.2014 (Annexure R-1) passed by the District Revenue Officer, Gurgaon, they may avail of their remedy in accordance with law.

The contempt petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

Rule issued to the respondents stands discharged.

**( AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASI )  
JUDGE**

**May 30, 2017**  
*Harish*

**Whether speaking/reasoned:  
Whether Reportable:**

**Yes/No  
Yes/No**