

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

**C.O.C.P. No. 2065 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.05.2018**

Amar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Chander Sekhar, Deputy Commissioner, Faridabad
and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. D.K. Mittal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Advocate
for respondents No. 2.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner (Amar Singh) had filed a writ petition bearing CWP No. 19123 of 2016 seeking mandamus to the respondents to decide his representations dated 09.12.1996, 28.08.2007, 24.04.2010 and 06.04.2015, and to allot the shop in *Sabzi Mandi* Area. The aforesaid writ petition was disposed of by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 04.10.2016 **(Annexure P-1)** with the directions to respondent No. 4 therein (Deputy Commissioner, Faridabad) to decide the representations of the petitioner in accordance with law, by passing a speaking order and after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of certified copy of the order.

It is averred that the Deputy Commissioner, Faridabad, has

directed the petitioner to approach the Commissioner, Municipal

Corporation, Faridabad, as the land in question measuring 15000 square yards of Rehabilitation Department was transferred to Municipal Corporation, Faridabad, accordingly, the petitioner has approached before the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Faridabad.

Since the needful was not done by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Faridabad, hence the present contempt petition was filed.

Upon notice, reply on behalf of respondent No. 2 (Sh. Mukesh Solanki, Joint Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Faridabad) stands filed. It is stated that in compliance of the order dated 04.10.2016 (**P-1**) passed by this Court, after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, a speaking order dated 15.03.2017 (**Annexure R-2/1**) has been passed, deciding the representation(s) of the petitioner, by rejecting his claim, and copy of the said order dated 15.03.2017 (**R-2/1**) has also been endorsed to the petitioner.

In view of above, counsel for the respondents state that nothing more survives for adjudication in the present contempt petition, as the same has become infructuous.

Disposed of.

Rule is discharged.

May 04, 2018

'dk kamra'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

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