

253

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.2093 of 2019
Date of decision: 02.09.2019

Gopal Chand

.. Petitioner

Versus

Sh. Tarun Kumar

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Garg, Advocate
for the respondent.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J. (Oral)

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of the order dated 20.08.2018 passed by this Court in CWP No. 20791 of 2018. The operative part of the order is reproduced below:

“Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.3-Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Bhucho Mandi, District Bathinda to consider the claim of the petitioner put forth by him in representations (P-5 and P-6) and to take a conscious decision, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against any of the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court as well as to have recourse to the other remedies available under law.”

Mr. Karan Garg, Advocate appears on behalf of the respondent and states that an order dated 05.11.2018 has been passed in pursuance to the directions passed by this Court. He further submits that an amount of Rs.1,08,975/- is yet to be paid to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is not disputing the said balance amount. However, the petitioner is raising a grievance that there is delayed payment, hence, the petitioner is entitled to interest.

Learned counsel for the respondent, on instructions from Mr. Jagjit Singh, E.O., submits that the payment of balance amount i.e. Rs.1, 08,975/- would be made within six weeks from today.

In view of the statement made today, the contempt petition is disposed of. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law for claiming interest, if so advised.

In case, payment is not made as per statement made today, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition. If the petitioner is forced to revive the contempt petition, exemplary costs may be imposed which shall be recovered personally from the defaulting official.

Rule issued against respondents is discharged.

02.09.2019

hemlata

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

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