

COCP No. 1145 of 2019
DECIDED ON: JULY 19, 2019

SUBHASH CHAND

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

INDRESH SHARMA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

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

Mr. Kanisth Ganeriwala, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Karan Vir Singh, Advocate
for the respondent No.3.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 28.09.2017 passed by this Court in CWP No. 22249 of 2017 and order dated 20.12.2018 passed by this Court in COCP No. 9890 of 2018.

The operational part of the order dated 28.09.2017, is reproduced below:-

“3. Accordingly, instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent(s) to consider the claim(s) of the petitioner unfolded by the petitioner in his legal notice dated 17.07.2017 (Annexure P-1) and to decide the same, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, the concerned authority comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief claimed through aforesaid legal notice, to

release/disburse the same within a period of next one month. The factum of grant of interest be also considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as “R.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab, 1997 (3) RSJ 318.

4. *However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved of the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.”*

Learned counsel for respondent No.3 has handed over calculations alongwith a cheque bearing No. 064552, dated 18.07.2019 amounting to ₹4,71,926/- drawn on Axis Bank Ltd., Kotkapura, to learned counsel for the petitioner. It is stated that the said amount was due as per respondents. Copy thereof, is taken on record.

In view of above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no cause of action survives in the present contempt petition, however, he seeks liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law in case he is aggrieved of the calculation or amount quantified by respondent No.3.

Disposed of as infructuous, with afore-said liberty.

The Rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

JULY 19, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

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