

COCP No.2475 of 2016

Date of Decision: 25.3.2019

Harpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Tapasya Raghav and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR

Present: Ms. Richudeep Bajaj, Advocate for
Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Namit Kumar, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to 5.

NIRMALJIT KAUR, J. (ORAL)

This order will dispose of three contempt petitions bearing COCP Nos.2475, 2508 and 2645 of 2016, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein. However, the facts have been taken from COCP No.2475 of 2016.

On 18.5.2017, Mr. Namit Kumar, Advocate appearing for respondent No.1 took time to prepare the case and address arguments. On 28.11.2017, the matter was adjourned on request of learned counsel for the petitioner(s) or the other. Again on 20.2.2018, the matter was adjourned on request of learned counsel for the petitioner(s). On 19.9.2018, while granting adjournment, it was held that in case counsel for the petitioner(s) makes any further request for adjournment, the case shall be decided in his absence. However, in spite of the same, the matter was still adjourned to 23.10.2018 while accepting the written request made by counsel for the petitioner(s). Today again, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) requests for further adjournment. However, no further adjournment can be granted.

The present contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance of the order dated 23.8.2016, vide which direction was issued to decide the representation by way of passing a reasoned order and status quo was directed to be maintained.

Reply has been filed. As per the said reply, the order has been complied with by way of speaking order dated 15.11.2016 (Annexure R-1/4. A perusal of the speaking order dated 15.11.2016 also shows that the possession of the property in dispute was never with the petitioner(s).

Moreover, the speaking order still has not been challenged. Accordingly, this Court finds that there is no willful disobedience of the order and no contempt is made out.

In view of the same, the present contempt petitions are dismissed.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

25.3.2019
sharmila

(NIRMALJIT KAUR)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No