

249

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

**COCP No.2190 of 2019
Date of Decision: 28.08.2019**

The Dalel Singh Wala Co-op L&C Society, Mansa

Petitioner

Versus

N.K. Garg, Managing Director, Punjab Water Resources
Management and Development Corporation Ltd. and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate
for the respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of order dated 30.01.2019 passed by this Court in CWP No.10269 of 2018.

The relevant portion of the order is reproduced below:-

“In view of the above, without advertng to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Divisional Engineer, Lining Division No.1, Punjab Water Resources Management and Development Corporation Limited, Punjab to consider and decide the legal notice dated 09.02.2018 (Annexure P3) within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the benefit claimed by the

petitioner is admissible to it, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to it, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the relief claimed by the petitioner is not admissible or made out, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.”

Learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions from Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Sub Divisional Engineer, Lining Division No.1, Punjab Water Resources Management and Development Corporation Ltd., Ferozepur, who is present in the Court, states that substantial payment has been made and balance payment of ₹1,38,004/- shall be made within six weeks from today.

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

None has put in appearance for the petitioner. In case the statement made today in the Court is not adhered to, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition. If the petitioner is forced to do so, costs may be imposed which shall be recoverable from the defaulting officers/officials personally.

The rule issued against the respondents stands discharged.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

August 28, 2019

pankaj baweja

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