

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No. 1926 of 2019
Date of decision: 11.9.2019

Baldev Singh Bajwa and others

.. Petitioners

v.

Jagmohan Singh Nagi and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Tahaf Bains, Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Deepali Puri, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate for respondent No. 4.

...

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of the order dated 7.2.2019 passed by this Court in CWP No. 413 of 2019. The said order is reproduced below:

“Notice of motion.

On asking of the court, Ms. Ishneet Kaur, AAG, Punjab accepts notice.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that for the relief sought in the petition, legal notice (Annexure P-1) has been served upon the concerned authority. They shall be satisfied if decision on the same is taken in a fixed time frame.

Learned State counsel submits that legal notice shall be considered by the competent authority and decision shall be taken within two months from today. In case any adverse order is passed, same shall be conveyed to the petitioner

forthwith.

In view of above, this petition is hereby disposed of.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that legal notice qua petitioners No. 1 and 2 has been decided, claim rejected and order conveyed. He seeks liberty to avail remedies available in accordance with law.

With regard to petitioner No. 3, learned counsel for the petitioners states that grievance still survives as no decision has been communicated.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 4 states that the matter has been referred to State of Punjab and to Department of Irrigation also for doing the needful.

Learned counsel for the State submits that the matter would be sorted out with Bhakra Beas Management Board and a decision would be taken and shall be communicated to the petitioner within four weeks from today.

In view of the above, the contempt petition is disposed of. However, the petitioners would be at liberty to avail remedies available in accordance with law against the order passed by the respondents.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

11.9.2019
mk

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