

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

**COCP No. 3883 of 2018 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: DECEMBER 17, 2019**

VEERO @ VEER KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

KULBIR SINGH ZIRA

.....RESPONDENT

AND

COCP No. 1918 of 2018 (O&M)

2. VEERO @ VEER KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

GURINDER SINGH DHILLON AND ANR

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. PPS Duggal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Puri, Addl. AG, Punjab with
Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG, Punjab assisted by SI Gurbachan Singh

Mr. Saurabh Singla, Advocate for
Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, Advocate
for the respondent in COCP No. 3883 of 2018.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The afore-mentioned petitions are being disposed of by common order, as similar issue is involved. For convenience, the facts are being taken from COCP No. 3883 of 2018.

The petitioner filed CRM-M-42259 of 2017, the same was disposed of on 30.05.2018 with liberty to the petitioner to move an application to respondent No.2 (in the petition) seeking protection for life and liberty for agricultural operation on the land detailed in the Criminal Misc. Petition. Respondent No.2 was directed to consider the same sympathetically and thereafter, police protection be provided to the petitioner for agricultural operation.

The present petition is filed as the needful is not done.

Today learned State counsel has filed a short reply by way of an affidavit of Mr. Vivek Sheel Soni, IPS, Senior Superintendent of Police, Ferozepur, same is taken on record, copy handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

In the affidavit, it is stated that even the possession of the disputed land as well as the residential house was given to the petitioner and the petitioner had also harvested the crop from the land without any agitation by any other party. It is further stated that investigation on the version and cross version cases are going on.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that possession of the entire land has not been handed over by the police.

The said aspect cannot be gone into in the contempt proceedings. The direction was only to provide police protection for agricultural operation, the same is complied with.

In view of above, no case is made out for contempt. The present petition is disposed of.

Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

Petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law for the redressal of surviving grievance, if any.

With the disposal of the main contempt petition all the connected civil misc. applications have been rendered infructuous and are disposed of as such.

DECEMBER 17, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>