

COCN No. 3768 of 2019

DECIDED ON: DECEMBER 09, 2019

SATNAM SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

JASKIRAN SINGH

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Baljinder Singh Ichhewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Puri Sandhu, Addl. AG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The petitioner filed a writ petition seeking direction to the Director, Rural Development and Panchayat Department, Punjab to conduct the enquiry on the complaint dated 30.08.2018 and also to take action against respondents No. 4 and 5 (in the writ petition). The writ petition was disposed of on 01.05.2019 and without adverting to the merits of the case, Director, Rural Development and Panchayat Department, Punjab was directed to consider and decide the representation dated 16.01.2019. The needful was to be done within six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. It was further ordered that in case the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the claim raised by the petitioner is made out, in such eventuality, needful would be done within a period of six weeks thereafter.

The present petition is filed pleading wilful disobedience of the directions of this Court.

Learned State counsel has filed a short reply by way of an affidavit of

Mr. Jaskiran Singh, Director, Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab annexing

the orders dated 16.10.2019, same is taken on record, copy handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

Learned State counsel submits that the decision on the representation has been taken. It is further submitted that the possession of the land in dispute/phirni was delivered to the Gram Panchayat and with regard to the loss caused by Lakhwinder Singh and Amrik Singh to the Gram Panchayat by digging out the bricks, it is submitted that an amount of ₹31,292/- in lieu of the same was deposited in the Panchayat account by the defaulters. Thereafter, the competent authority came to the conclusion that there is no need to register FIR. She contends that from the order, it is forthcoming that the name of the petitioner was also there in the list of illegal occupants.

Learned counsel for the petitioner still raises a grievance that inspite of passing of the order, the street has not been relaid.

The said aspect cannot be gone into in the contempt proceedings as the directions of this Court was only to decide the representation.

The representation has been decided, necessary steps to recover the amount from the defaulters is taken and the possession already handed over to the Gram Panchayat.

In view of above, the present petition is disposed of.

Rule issued against the respondent stands discharged.

Petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedy in accordance with law for the redressal of surviving grievance.

DECEMBER 09, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

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