

231

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No. 828 of 2018

DECIDED ON: SEPTEMBER 03, 2019

ANARO DEVI

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

INDERESH SHARMA, DIRECTOR AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Vikas Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Khokhar, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of the order dated 22.11.2017 passed in CWP No. 26583 of 2017.

The operational part of the order is quoted below:-

“4. *Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in her legal notice dated October 04, 2017 (P-1) and to take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order considering all the facts narrated in the aforesaid legal notice within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. In case, competent authorities comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief(s) claimed, same be released to her within a period of next 45 days. Factum of interest in view of judgment passed by Full Bench of this Court in case A.S. Randhawa vs.*

State of Punjab & Ors., 1997 (3) SCT 468 as well as judgment passed by this Court in CWP No.8772 of 2015 captioned as Charan Dass vs. State of Punjab & Ors. decided on July 11, 2017, shall also be considered on delayed payment(s).

5. *However, if petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the orders passed by the aforesaid authority, she shall be at liberty to approach this Court.”*

Pursuant to the notice of motion, reply was filed annexing the orders dated 07.05.2018 and 07.09.2018. As per the orders petitioner was found entitled to ₹10,46,581/- alongwith interest @12% per annum.

Learned State counsel submits that the afore-said amount has been disbursed to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is not able to dispute the said fact due to lack of instructions. He, however, submits that he may be granted liberty to avail the remedy in accordance with law, if aggrieved of the amount calculated.

In view of above, no cause of action survives for pursuing the present contempt petition.

Disposed of as infructuous with liberty as prayed for.

Rule issued against the respondents stand discharged.

SEPTEMBER 03, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether reportable *Yes/No*