

234

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**COCP No.1732 of 2019
Date of Decision: 19.07.2019**

The Gagsina Coop. Transport Society Ltd.

Petitioner

Versus

Pankaj Aggarwal, IAS, Transport Commissioner, Haryana and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Raj Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 11.04.2019 passed by this Court in CWP No.9778 of 2019.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“Petitioner submits that for the grievance aired in the petition, he has also filed a representation, Annexure P-12 before the concerned authority.

On the asking of the court, Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana, who is present in court, accepts notice on behalf of the State. He submits that in case, representation, Annexure P-12, has been received in the office of respondent No.2, same shall be looked into within two weeks from today.

In view of statement made by learned State counsel, no further direction is necessary. Petition is hereby disposed of.”

The respondents have filed reply by way of affidavit of Anish Yadav, IAS, Additional Deputy Commissioner-cum-Regional Transport Authority, Karnal, same is taken on record. Copy of reply is handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner. Alongwith the reply, Annexure R-3 has been appended. The relevant portion is reproduced below:-

“A copy is forwarded to the following for operating the amended time table dated 25.02.2019 for Karnal to Assandh, issued by the Secretary RTA Karnal.

1. *Station Supervisor, Karnal.*
2. *Stand Incharge, Assandh.*
3. *Duty Inspector, Haryana Roadways, Karnal.”*

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that two grievances were raised and one of them has not been dealt with.

Learned State counsel states that fresh order will be passed within four weeks from today.

In view of statement made, contempt petition is disposed of as infructuous.

Petitioner would be at liberty to revive the petition, if discrepancy is found in the statement made by learned State counsel today in the Court.

The rule issued against the respondents is discharged.

**[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE**

July 19, 2019

pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |