

211

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

**COCP-3878-2017
Date of decision: 16.09.2019**

DARSHAN LAL**.. PETITIONER****Versus****DEEPAK SAHARAN****.. RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present: Mr. Naresh Upadhaya, Advocate for
Mr. R.S.Malhotra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 18.09.2017 passed by this Court in C|RM-M No. 34692 of 2017. The operative part of the order is reproduced below:

“Without making any observation on the claim as projected by the petitioners, but considering the fact that the petitioners have confined their prayer to the extent of protection of his life and liberty only, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.2 to look into the contents of representation dated 01.08.2017 (Annexure P-1) and to consider the claim of the petitioners so far as the relief of the protection of their life and liberty is concerned.”

Pursuant to notice of motion, a reply has been filed, alongwith reply, inquiry reports dated 22.08.2018 and 03.02.2018 and order dated 21.02.2017 have been annexed.

Learned State counsel submits that the matter was looked into and after inquiry the allegations of burning of tractor by the opposite party

were not found true. The concerned local police was directed to keep survey of the house of the complainant/petitioner and for that reason police help was not provided at that stage and in case, the occasion so arises, it would be provided. It is submitted that the directions for taking necessary steps have been issued by the Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad to Deputy Superintendent of Police, Tohana and Station House officer, Police Station Jhakhal.

In view of the above, no cause of action survives for pursuing the present contempt petition. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law, if aggrieved of the order dated 22.02.2017 or against the inquiry reports dated 22.08.2018 and 03.02.2018.

Disposed of.

Rule issued against the respondents is discharged.

16th September, 2019
shabha

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*