

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

Gurpreet Kaur
2018.01.27 13:37
Attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
high court

COC P No.890 of 2015

Date of Decision: 25.01.2018

Gurmeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Rajat Aggarwal and others

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Rajeev Kawatra, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Ms. Anu Chatrath, Addl. A.G., Punjab.
Mr. Ashok Bazaz, Advocate
for respondent No.2.
Mr. H.S. Brar, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

After hearing the arguments of learned counsel for the parties, it appears that there is a dispute being neighbourers as the house of the petitioner is closer to the building of the *gurudwara*. No doubt, there was some damage to the wall but it has been stated to be repaired. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that some encroachment is there by the *gurudwara*, whereas, it has been stated by learned counsel for respondent No.2-Municipal Corporation that the land has been taken on rent by *gurudwara*.

Disputed questions on facts cannot be determined by this Court in the Contempt petition.

The petition is disposed of.

However, in case, the petitioner is still aggrieved in any manner, he is at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy.

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

25.01.2018
gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No