

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP-2085-2020

Date of Decision: 13.10.2020

Aashish Mandhwani

...Petitioner

vs.

A.K. Singh and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Amitabh Tewari, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, is for initiating proceedings against respondent No.2 for willful and deliberate disobedience of the order of this Court dated 05.03.2020, in CWP No.6208 of 2020, in case titled as Aashish Mandhwani vs. State of Haryana and others.

3. Learned counsel contends that vide order dated 05.03.2020, CWP No.6208 of 2020, was disposed of with a direction that in case representation dated 04.11.2019 and 10.01.2020, submitted by the petitioner to the Town and Country Planning Department, had been received, the same be considered and decided by the competent authority, at the earliest but that despite lapse of sufficient period of time, needful has not been done.

4. Notice of motion to respondent No.2.

5. Mr. Sumit Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf

states that needful could not be done due to circumstances prevailing on account of Covid-19 pandemic but in case four weeks more time is granted, needful would be done and orders passed on the representations would also be conveyed to the petitioner.

6. The same satisfies learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. 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 respondent No.4 to decide representations dated 04.11.2019 and 10.01.2020, in terms of the undertaking given by the respondent through learned Addl. AG, Haryana, within four weeks from today and to convey the orders passed in respect thereto, 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

13.10.2020
'Amit-Rajesh'

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