

CROCP-11-2016

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

CROCP-11-2016

Date of decision: 26.03.2018

Bhoop Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Sh. M.K.V.Ramarao, Managing Director and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Petitioner No.1-Bhoop Singh in person with
Mr. H.P.S.Rahi, legal aid counsel.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Petitioner No.1-Bhoop Singh alongwith his counsel appeared
before this Court.

Heard.

Learned counsel for petitioner No.1 argued for some time.
However, petitioner No.1-Bhoop Singh intervened and started arguing for
himself. This Court permitted him to do so for some time.

This Court had made an order on 07.02.2018 asking petitioner
No.1 to satisfy as to how the cognizance of the criminal contempt can be
taken in the present case in violation of the provisions of Section 15 of the
Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

Petitioner No.1 as well as his counsel are expected to respond
to the order dated 07.02.2018.

The grievance of petitioner No.1 is that in civil writ petition
No.3485 of 1989, decided on 23.03.2010, this Court issued directions to the
employer of petitioner No.1. Thereafter, the directions were complied with

CROCP-11-2016

by the employer vide order dated 30.03.2016. However, by another office order dated 31.03.2016 (Annexure P-9), the Under Secretary/Estt. (NG) for Chief Engineer/Admn., HPGCL, Panchkula kept the said order in abeyance till the final decision is taken in the matter.

Learned counsel for petitioner No.1 could not point out any representation to the said authority to know the reason for keeping the said order in abeyance. It is this order (Annexure P-9) which the petitioner No.1 claims to be the Criminal Contempt of Court.

We have given our thoughtful consideration to the submissions made before us by petitioner No.1 and his counsel.

We find that no criminal contempt as such is constituted within the meaning of Section 2 (c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 by any stretch of imagination. At the most, petitioner No.1 can be allowed to make his grievance in appropriate proceedings, if at all the civil contempt or any other proceedings maintainable in law.

ORDER

Criminal Contempt Petition No.11 of 2016 is dismissed with liberty to petitioner No.1 to make his grievance in appropriate proceedings according to law.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

26.03.2018

parveen kumar

Note: Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No