

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COC-2088-2020

Date of Decision: 13.10.2020

Ramesh Chand

...Petitioner

vs.

Jaspreet Talwar

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Dinesh Mahajan, 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 Contempt Petition under Sections 10/12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, is for initiating contempt proceedings against the respondent for willful and deliberate disobedience of order of this Court dated 12.06.2020, passed in CWP No.8018 of 2020, in case titled as Ramesh Chand and others vs. State of Punjab and others.
3. Learned counsel contends that vide order dated 12.06.2020, CWP No.8018 of 2020, was disposed of by directing the respondent to decide the representation dated 18.10.2019, in accordance with law, preferably within three months from the date of order but despite lapse of sufficient period of time, needful has not been done.
4. Notice of motion.
5. Ms. Deepali Puri, Addl. AG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and 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 representation dated 18.10.2019, would 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 for directing the respondent to comply with the undertaking submitted through learned Addl. AG, Punjab and decide the representation dated 18.10.2019, in accordance with law, within four weeks from today and to convey the orders passed in respect thereto, to the petitioner within one week thereafter. Needless to mention in case the petitioner is not satisfied with the orders to be passed by the respondents, he would be at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law. 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