

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

COCN No. 2656 of 2019

DECIDED ON: AUGUST 26, 2019

RANJIT KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

A. VENU PRASAD AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. B.S. Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanisth Ganeriwala, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Himmat Singh Shergill, Advocate
for respondent No.3

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The present contempt petition has been filed pleading wilful disobedience of the order dated 03.12.2018 passed in CWP No. 28761 of 2018.

The operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“ Without going into the merits of the case or expressing any opinion to the entitlement of the petitioner in respect of the claim prayed in the present writ petition or in the legal notice, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to pass an appropriate speaking order on the claim raised by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 17.09.2018 (Annexure P-1) within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.”

In compliance of the order dated 05.08.2019, Mr. Karnesh Sharma,

Director, Local Government, Punjab is present in Court and tenders an unconditional apology.

Reply filed on behalf of respondent No.3 is taken on record. Copy handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

Learned State counsel submits that an application for exemption of personal appearance of Principal Secretary, Local Government, Punjab is ready but the same could not be filed.

Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that the order of this Court has been complied with.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not disputed the compliance of order. He, however, submits that the payment has been made late and petitioner be granted liberty to avail remedy for claiming interest for the delayed period.

In view of the reply filed and unconditional apology tendered, no cause of action survives for pursuing the contempt petition.

Disposed of as infructuous.

Rule issued against the respondents stand discharged.

The petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance for his claim for interest on the delayed payment.

AUGUST 26, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>