

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No. 2273 of 2017

Date of Decision: 23.07.2019

Satbir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

K. Makrand Pandurang and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

This contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 30.5.2017 passed in CWP No. 26503 of 2015.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:

"In view of the aforesaid stand taken by learned counsel for the State, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that though the aforesaid documents have already been furnished, however, still the petitioner will furnish a fresh copy thereof to the Collector at Sonapat.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is disposed of. The petitioner may furnish fresh copies of his bank account particulars and the identity proof with the Collector at Sonapat. On furnishing thereof, within one week thereafter, the amount of compensation as determined by the Collector shall be deposited in the account of the petitioner."

After issuance of notice, reply was filed by way of affidavit of Raj Kumar Bhorla, Land Acquisition Collector, Urban Estate, Rohtak.

As per the said reply, respondents have paid a sum of ₹1,39,363/-.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that his share in the joint estate has not been properly provided/appreciated by the respondents. He seeks permission to withdraw the present contempt petition with liberty to move a comprehensive representation to the Land Acquisition Collector, Rohtak.

Learned State counsel on instructions states that in case such a representation is made, the same would be decided in accordance with law after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

Let the representation be filed within four weeks from today and thereafter, the respondents shall make all endeavour to decide it as expeditiously as possible. Needless to say that if still aggrieved by the order passed, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Rule issued against the respondents is hereby discharged.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

23.07.2019
reema

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No