

COCN No. 1805 of 2018
DECIDED ON: JULY 15, 2019

BHUDEV SHARMA AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

VIKAS GUPTA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate
for the petitioners.Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate and
Mr. Sudarshan Kumar, Advocate
for the respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading willful disobedience of order dated 16.02.2017 of this Court passed in CWP No. 18430 of 2010. Operational part of the order is reproduced as below:-

“Consequently, HUDA-authorities are directed to allot plots to the petitioners as they were successful in draw of lots and plots have already been kept reserved by this Court vide order dated 21.03.2013.

Needful shall be done within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.”

Learned counsel for the respondents has filed short reply by way of an affidavit of Deepak, Estate Officer, HSVP, Rewari, same is taken on record. Copy thereof, has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner. Alongwith the reply, proceedings of mini draw of lots for allotment of plots held on 25.06.2019 has been annexed as Annexure R-1.

As per Annexure R-1, plot No.800-P has been earmarked to Bhudev Sharma, plot No. 809-GP has been earmarked to Proj Kumar and plot No. 810-GP has been earmarked to Birender Singh. It has further been mentioned in the annexure that the matter has been sent to Chief Controller of Finance Panchkula for fixing the rate for the current financial year 2019-20 in respect of residential plots and on receiving the same the allotment letters would be issued to the petitioners.

In view of the reply filed by the respondents, learned counsel for the petitioners states that no cause of action survives in the present contempt petition.

Disposed of as infructuous.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

There is no doubt that needful for the issuance of allotment letters to the petitioners shall be done expeditiously by the respondents considering the fact that the order passed by this Court was time bound.

Needless to say that petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies as are available in accordance with law in case still there is any grievance.

JULY 15, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>