

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

COCP No.1120 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 16.02.2018

JOGA SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

**PINKI RANI, DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT & PANCHAYAT
OFFICER, JALANDHAR**

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manoj Bajaj, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

CM No.23403-CII2017

The present application moved by the counsel for the respondent/State is for placing on record the short reply by way of affidavit dated 30.10.2017 of Iqbaljeet Singh, District Development & Panchayat Officer, Jalandhar.

Application is allowed, as prayed for. The reply is taken on record.

Registry to tag/paginate the application at appropriate place in the paper book.

COCP No.1120 of 2017

Petitioner had filed a writ petition bearing CWP No.17705 of

2016, seeking issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents-authorities to take action against Lachman Dass and Kulwinder Singh (respondent Nos.5 and 6 therein), on the representation dated 06.06.2016 made by the petitioner, whereby he had sought to conduct an enquiry regarding the mis-appropriation of funds by former Sarpanch Lachman Dass and Kulwinder Singh under the garb of various development works.

The aforesaid writ petition was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 30.08.2016 (**Annexure P-1**), with the direction '*to D.D.P.O., Jalandhar-respondent No.3 to look into the matter, consider the grievance of the petitioner raised in his representation dated 06.06.2016 (**Annexure P-2**) 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 certified copy of this order.*'

It is averred that after receiving the aforesaid order dated 30.08.2016 (**P-1**), the respondent marked an enquiry into the matter to BDPO, Nakodar vide letter dated 30.11.2016 and subsequently the petitioner was called for conducting the enquiry. However, till date the representation dated 06.06.2016 (**P-2**) of the petitioner has not been decided, hence the present contempt petition.

Learned counsel for the respondent/State states that in compliance of the order dated 30.08.2016 (**P-1**) a speaking order dated 08.06.2017 (**Annexure R-1**) has been passed, therefore, no further action is warranted in the present contempt, as the same has become infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also concedes the aforesaid factual position.

Dismissed as infructuous.

February 16, 2018
'rajneesh'

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>