

224

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

**COCP No.3034 of 2018
Date of Decision: 10.07.2019**

Tek Chand Bansal and others

Petitioners

Versus

A. Venu Prasad, IAS, Secretary, Department of Local Government,
Punjab and others

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Vishal R. Lamba, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kanisth Ganeriwala, AAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1.

Mr. A.S. Chadha, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 25.10.2017 passed by this Court in CWP No.8647 of 1993. Operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that as the policy has been framed by the Government, in case the petitioners apply for any benefit under that policy, the case of the petitioners shall be considered in terms thereof.

In view of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is disposed of accordingly. The

needful shall be done within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of the order.”

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has filed reply of Chairman, Improvement Trust, Patiala on behalf of respondents today in the Court, same is taken on record. Copy handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 states that order dated 28.01.2019 has been passed considering the case of the petitioner and as per policy framed by the Government, claim of the petitioner has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that claim has wrongly been rejected as the policy has not been considered in correct perspective.

In view of reply filed, no cause of action survives in the contempt petition.

The present contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous. Rule issued against the respondent is discharged.

However, petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies available in accordance with law, in case aggrieved of order dated 28.01.2019.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

July 10, 2019

pankaj baweja

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