

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

COC-1268-2020

Date of decision: - 09.07.2020

Tanashekhar alias Thana Sekar and another

....Petitioners

Versus

Shalinder Singh, Chief Engineer, Municipal Corporation, Sector 17,
U.T., Chandigarh and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Ashok Sharma Nabhwala, Advocate
with Ms. Gauri Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been taken for hearing through video conference due to Covid-19 pandemic.

In the present contempt petition, the grievance which is being raised by the petitioners is that the order dated 29.10.2019 passed by this Court in CWP-21607-2016 titled as Tanashekhar alias Thana Sekar and another Vs. U.T. Administration through Advisor, Chandigarh and others, is not being complied with by the respondents and they are intentionally and wilfully disobeying the order passed by this Court dated 29.10.2019 making themselves liable to be proceeded against under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that vide order dated 29.10.2019 passed in CWP-21607-2016, directions were issued,

which were to be complied with by the respondents within a period of three months, but the same have not been complied with by the respondents so far.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Deepali Puri Sandhu, Advocate, who has joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of respondents.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents states that as per the instructions received to her, the directions given in terms of order dated 29.10.2019 passed by this Court in CWP-21607-2016 will be complied with by the respondents within a period of four weeks from today by passing appropriate order and the same will be conveyed to the petitioners as well.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the above statement given by learned counsel for the respondents, he does not want to press the present contempt petition any further. However, learned counsel for the petitioners prays that liberty be granted to the petitioners to approach this Court again, in case, the undertaking recorded on behalf of the respondents is violated.

In view of the above, present petition is being disposed of having not pressed with liberty as prayed for.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

July 09, 2020
naresh.k

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No