

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No. 1311 of 2019

Date of Decision: 08.07.2019

The Guru Gobind Singh Nagar Co-operative Labour and Construction
Society Ltd.

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Sarvjit Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Munish Bansal and Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocates
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. S.S. Bedi, Advocate
for respondents (PWRMDC).

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(oral)

This contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful
disobeyance of order dated 24.7.2018 passed in CWP No. 5202 of 2018.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:

"Since, the petitioner(s) have prayed for a writ in the nature of mandamus which can be issued by this Court only if there is a right vested with the petitioner(s) and there is a corresponding duty on the part of the respondent-Corporation. In the present case, neither the rights of the petitioner have been denied nor the respondent-Corporation has denied its liability, therefore, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, present bunch of writ petitions are hereby disposed with a direction to the respondent-Corporation to release the payment to the petitioners, in which there is no dispute, within four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, where there is some dispute raised by them then the respondent-Corporation would associate the petitioner(s) for the purpose of sorting out the said dispute and shall make the payment accordingly."

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate has filed reply along with speaking order today in Court, which is taken on record. Copy of the reply given to learned counsel for the petitioner.

As per the order passed annexed with reply, there is an amount of ₹5,42,401/- due to be paid to the petitioner for which it has been stated that the funds have been asked from the State Government.

Learned counsel for respondents states that the funds with regard to bills submitted by the petitioners are to be provided by the State and respondents are not having funds of their own and as soon as the same are received the same would be released within a fortnight thereafter.

In view of the statement made above, no interference is called for in the contempt proceedings.

The rule issued against respondents is hereby discharged.

Disposed of.

However, it is clarified that in case the petitioner is aggrieved of order passed by the respondent, he would be at liberty to avail remedy as available in accordance with law if any.

08.07.2019

reema

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No