

202

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP-868-2014(O&M)

Date of Decision: March 07, 2019

Bal Kishan

.....Petitioner

Versus

Dalip Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE NIRMALJIT KAUR

Present: Mr.Sandeep Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

.....

NIRMALJIT KAUR, J. (ORAL)

CM-6519-CII-2014

Application is allowed and Annexures P-1 to P-4 are taken on record.

COCP-868-2014

The contempt petition is filed for non-compliance of the order dated 18.11.2013 vide which only a direction was issued to DDPO to look into grievance of the petitioner and take necessary action.

The affidavit was filed way back on 18.10.2016 in which in para No.3 it is stated that khasra No.78, 61, 27/26, 28/26 are lying vacant on the spot. As per the Rapat Roznamcha dated 26.03.2014, the construction has been shown in khasra No.60 min, 74 min and 76 and the possession of the same alongwith houses was delivered to the Gram Panchayat at that time in compliance of the order dated 18.11.2013.

Admittedly, the petitioner is aggrieved of the fact that the said

land is now leased out by he Gram Panchayat.

If it is so, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law as cancellation of the lease, if any, is outside of the scope of the contempt petition.

In this view of the matter, the contempt petition is dismissed.

The rule issued against the respondent(s) stands discharged.

As the contempt petition stands dismissed, there is no need to pass separate orders in the miscellaneous applications. The same have been rendered infructuous and stand disposed of as such.

March 07, 2019

meenuss

**(NIRMALJIT KAUR)
JUDGE**

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |