

220

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.3376 of 2017
Date of decision: 02.09.2019

Mehtab Singh and others

.. Petitioners

Versus

Sh. J. Ganesan and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Kulwant Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate
for the respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 31.05.2017 passed by this Court in CWP No. 12394 of 2017. The operative part of the order is reproduced below:

“Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners and keeping in view the fact that these very issues have been raised by the petitioners in their representation-cum-objections [P-6 (colly.)], the instant writ petition is disposed of without expressing any views on merits, with a direction to respondent Nos.2 & 3 to consider and decide those objections by way of a reasoned order and preferably by giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners in representative capacity provided that they decide to nominate not more than three of them for such hearing. HUDA authorities shall supply complete statement of accounts to enable the petitioners to file their objections against the same. If still aggrieved, the petitioners

may represent before the departmental authorities against such order and deposit the demanded amount without prejudice to their legal rights. An appropriate decision shall be taken within a period of three months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order.”

Short reply by way of affidavit of Sh. Virender Singh, IAS, Zonal Administrator, HSVP, Rohtak, filed in Court is taken on record. A copy of the same is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate appears on behalf of the respondents and states that there is a delay in complying the order as a Committee of three members was formed and on the recommendations of the Committee, a policy has been finalized. He further states that a speaking order would be passed within three months from today.

In view of the statement made in Court today, the contempt petition is disposed of.

However, it is clarified that in case, the statement made in the Court today is not adhered to, the petitioners would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition.

Rule issued against respondents is discharged.

02.09.2019

hemlata

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No