

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

COCN No. 1946 of 2017

Date of Decision: 17.09.2019

Ritika

.....Petitioner

Versus

Mukesh Mittal

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Advocate
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

The petitioner filed a writ petition challenging the cancellation of retail outlet of a petrol pump. The writ petition was dismissed on 13.10.2014. An intra-court appeal was preferred which was allowed on 6.4.2017 and order of cancellation was set aside.

The contempt petition was filed alleging that needful has not been done by the respondents after setting aside of cancellation order. A reply dated 2.3.2019 was filed with advance copy to counsel for the petitioner supplied on 11.4.2019. Along with reply, a Letter Of Intent (LOI) dated 24.8.2018 has been annexed as Annexure-R1.

Learned counsel for respondent states that terms and conditions mentioned in LOI have not been substantially complied with by the petitioner, hence, needful could not be done.

There is no rejoinder filed to the reply which was supplied to counsel for the petitioner way back in April 2019.

Even today learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to prove that the terms and conditions of LOI have been complied with.

In such circumstances, no case is made out for wilful disobedience of order dated 6.4.2017 passed by this Court in LPA No. 862 of 2015.

The contempt petition is dismissed.

Rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

17.09.2019

reema

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No