

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 1091 of 2019
Date of decision: 11.7.2019

Daljit Singh

.. Petitioner

v.

Jaskiran Singh

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Ms. Bhavna Kapur, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Deepali Puri, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

...

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 5.9.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No. 16054 of 2007. The operative part of the said order is reproduced below:

“In view of above but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2 to consider and decide the aforesaid application dated 15.12.2006 (P-9) especially in view judgment passed by Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in CWP No. 5661 of 1999, titled as **Kasturi Lal Khurana and others v. State of Punjab and others**; decided on 4.4.2000 and also in view of judgments passed by this Court in CWP No. 5131 of 2010, titled as **Sushil Kumari v. State of Punjab and others**; decided on 1.4.2013, 9125 of

2011, titled as **Satish Rani Sood vs. State of Punjab and others**, decided on 1.4.2013 and CWP No. 4378 of 2006, titled as **Sita Devi w/o Manohar Lal vs. State of Punjab and others**; decided on 13.8.2015 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

However, in case petitioner still feels aggrieved by any of the order passed by respondent No. 2, he shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available under the law including to approach this Court.”

Learned State counsel submits that order has been passed in compliance of the order and the contempt petition has been rendered infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that no cause of action survives for pursuing contempt.

Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

Rule is discharged.

If any grievance survives against the order passed by the respondent, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies available in accordance with law.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

11.7.2019
mk

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No