

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

COCP No. 1698 of 2016

Date of Decision: 17.09.2019

Ramesh Chand

.....Petitioner

Versus

Gagandeep Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr.C.B. Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. DAG Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

The writ petition filed by the petitioner for direction to respondent to provide drainage of the sullage water of village Sandhayee, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar, as it accumulated in the agricultural fields of the petitioner. The petition was disposed of with direction to the State Government i.e. Department of Development and Panchayat to take a decision with regard to grant of ₹ 5 lacs and DDPO (District Development and Panchayat Officer) was directed to execute the work immediately after the receipt of the grant.

In pursuance of notice of motion, replies were filed.

As per the pleadings in the reply, the respondents have provided drain and drainage pipe for disposal of the sullage water of the village into the village pond. It has been stated that the Nala constructed by the Gram Panchayat has been inspected by SDO (PR) and Sh. Yogender Singh, J.E.

Further, it is pleaded that the kacha houses adjacent to the pond have been removed by the Gram Panchayat.

Mr. Surinder Kumar, Gram Sachiv, village Bilaspur District Yamunanager, present in Court states that a pacca drainage/nala has been made for carrying the village sullage to the pond. He further states that a pump has been installed for draining the water from the pond to forest area in the eventuality of overfilling of pond.

In view of reply filed and statement made today in Court, there is a substantial compliance of the directions of this Court and grievance of the petitioner stands addressed.

No further interference is called for in the contempt proceedings.

Disposed of.

However, it is made clear that in case there is any discrepancy in the statement made today in Court by Mr. Surinder Kumar, Gram Sachiv, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition.

In case some grievance still survives with regard to accumulation of water in the fields of the petitioner, he would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law.

Rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

17.09.2019
reema

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No