

214

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

**COCP No.2100 of 2018
Date of Decision: 08.07.2019**

Nachhatar Singh

Petitioner

Versus

Gurkirat Kirpal Singh, Secretary to the Department of Defence
Services Welfare, Punjab, Chandigarh.

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 06.09.2017 passed by this Court in CWP No.20067 of 2017. Operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“5. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his representation dated 27.03.2017 (Annexure P-6) and decide the same, particularly keeping in view the observations made by this Court in CWP No. 324 of 2016, captioned as “Ex-Corporal Sukhvinder Singh Sekhon and others v. State of Punjab and another” (Annexure P-7), by passing a speaking order, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. However, in case, the petitioner still feels aggrieved

of the order passed by respondent(s), he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Sh. Naresh Rattan, Senior Assistant, Defence Services Welfare Department and Mr. Tarajit Singh, Senior Assistant, Irrigation Department, states that in order to decide the claim of the petitioner, amendment of the Rules was being awaited. He further states that now the said Rules have been amended and notified. A speaking order on the representation dated 27.03.2017 would be passed within three months from today, after providing opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of statement made by learned counsel for the respondent, no cause of action survives at this stage. He further states that in case of any grievance from any order of the respondent, the petitioner may be granted liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law.

In view of above statement, the present contempt petition is disposed of with liberty as prayed for. The rule issued against the respondent is discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

July 08, 2019

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes/ No