

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**COCP No.238 of 2021(O&M)
Date of Decision: November 09, 2021**

Inderjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

S.Manpreet Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

--

Present: - Mr. Divay Sarup, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, AAG, Punjab.

-

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

By filing the present contempt petition, Inderjit Singh - petitioner has alleged non-compliance of order dated 19.11.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by this Court in Civil Writ Petition No.33586 of 2019 titled 'Inderjit Singh vs. State of Punjab'.

The petitioner is Panch of Gram Panchayat, Village Satowali, Block Adampur, District Jalandhar. He had raised his concerns about the working of the Gram Panchayat before the concerned State Authorities, which allegedly were not adhered to. He filed the aforesaid writ petition, which was disposed of vide order dated 19.11.2019, operative part of which reads:

“In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- The Director, Department of Village Development and Panchayat, Mohali to consider and decide

the representation dated 11.06.2019 (Annexure P-3) in accordance with law within six weeks from the receipt of the certified copy of the judgment. In case, on consideration, the competent authority reaches to the conclusion that the request made by the petitioner is admissible, in such eventuality, the consequential relief be allowed to him, within a period of six weeks thereafter. However, in case the competent authority feels that the request made by the petitioner is not admissible, in that case, a speaking order be passed in the matter.”

The petitioner filed the instant contempt petition alleging that even after a lapse of one year from the passing of the order, reproduced above, the respondent has not taken any decision on the representation of the petitioner.

Short reply by way of affidavit of Manpreet Singh, Director, Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab has been filed, wherein, it is stated that the representation dated 11.06.2019 (Annexure P-4) [inadvertently typed as 11-06-2020 (Annexure P-3)] has been considered and decided vide order dated 27.02.2020 (Annexure R-1/T). It is further stated that though some delay has been caused in deciding the representation of the petitioner but the same is neither intentional nor deliberate.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner has contended that the representation has been decided in an illegal manner and the speaking order passed is bad in the eyes of law as it has ignored the material facts.

Be that as it may, the respondent has passed a speaking order dated 27.02.2020 (Annexure R-1/T), wherein, all the six points raised by the petitioner in his application dated 11.06.2019 (Annexure P4) have been dealt

with separately and the application of the petitioner has been ordered to be filed.

Hence, the Rule is discharged.

If the petitioner is aggrieved of the order dated 27.02.2020, he may avail appropriate remedies available in law challenging the said order.

Petition stands disposed of.

November 09, 2021
gian

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking / Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes / No