

Sunita Goyal

...Petitioner

versus

Mahavir Singh, IAS

....Respondent

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

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 30.04.2019 in CWP-11103-2019

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) dated 30.04.2019, reveals that CWP-11103-2019 was disposed of by directing the respondent to look into representation dated 10.01.2019 and legal notice dated 12.02.2019 and to pass an appropriate order in accordance with law within four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case speaking order had already been passed on the legal notice dated 12.02.2019 then appropriate order be passed by annexing the said detailed order.

[3] Learned DAG, Haryana refers to order Annexure R-1 dated 10.03.2022 filed by the respondent rejecting the claim made in the representation as also in the legal notice dated 10.01.2019 and 12.02.2019

respectively. Learned DAG states that copy of the reply has already been

supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner but despite the case having been passed over in the pre lunch session on account of none being present on behalf of the petitioner, none is present on behalf of the petitioner even in the post lunch session. It appears that in the circumstances, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition.

[4] I have considered the submission of learned State counsel. Admittedly, order, Annexure R-1 dated 10.03.2022 has been passed rejecting the claim made in representation dated 10.01.2019 and legal notice dated 12.02.2019. The same, as has already been stated, has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, but despite the case having been called out twice, none is present on behalf of the petitioner.

[5] Learned DAG, Haryana states that in the circumstances, in view of order Annexure R-1 dated 10.03.2022, no action is called for against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and the instant petition may be disposed of as such.

[6] Accordingly, in view of the position noted above, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge order Annexure R-1 dated 10.03.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

16.08.2022

amit