

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 1314 of 2019
Date of decision: 8.7.2019

Arvind Bhardwaj

.. Petitioner

v.

K. M. Pandurang and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ashish Yadav, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

...

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 28.8.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No. 21595 of 2018. The operative part of the said order is reproduced below:

“We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and are of the considered view that if there is any substance in the contents of the writ petition, the complaint-cum-representation (P-4) made by the petitioners requires immediate attention at the hands of the respondents. The writ petition is thus disposed of without expressing any views on merits of the allegations, with a direction to respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to look into the complaint made by the petitioners and take appropriate remedial action in accordance with law and principles of natural justice, within a period of two months

from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order.”

Reply by way of affidavit of K. Makrand Pandurang, Director, Department of Town & Country Planning, Haryana, Chandigarh i.e. respondent No. 1 has been filed in court today. Copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that some remedial action has been taken. The allegation was that 21 toilets were converted into office space. On site inspection, it was found that 17 toilets have been constructed and for the remaining learned counsel for the State submits that report has been sent to the Head Office and remedial measures would be taken within four weeks.

In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed in the contempt petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous. The rule issued is discharged.

It is, however, clarified that in case of failure of the respondents to do needful, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition and the revival would be at the cost and responsibility of the respondents.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

8.7.2019
mk

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