

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCp-1886-2020

Date of Decision: 09.10.2020

Balraj ...Petitioner

vs.

Pardeep Kumar ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia.

Present: Mr. Anshul Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Arya, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

1. Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to the outbreak of pandemic Covid-19.
2. Prayer in the Petition under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, is for punishing the respondent for willful and deliberate disobedience of the order of this Court Annexure P/2, dated 31.07.2020, passed in CWP No.11083 of 2020, in case titled as Balraj and others vs. State of Haryana and others.
3. Learned counsel contends that vide order dated 31.07.2020, CWP No.11083 of 2020, was disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to pass speaking order on the petitioner's representation Annexure P/10 dated 18.02.2020, within three weeks from the date of communication of the order, but despite lapse of aforementioned period of time, needful has not been done.
4. Mr. Rohit Arya, DAG, Haryana, on instructions from the respondent states that in case one week more time is granted, needful would be done and order passed on the representation Annexure P/10 dated 18.02.2020, conveyed to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, in view of the statement of learned counsel for the parties, the Contempt Petition is disposed of as not calling for any orders except directing the respondent to decide representation Annexure P/10 dated 18.02.2020, within one week from today and to convey the speaking order to the petitioner within one week thereafter. However, it is made clear that in case the needful is not done within the stipulated period of time, the petitioner would be at liberty to move an application for revival of the Contempt Petition.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

09.10.2020
'Amit-Rajesh'

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