

Babli Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

Deepak Yadav

....Respondent

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

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Saini, Advocate for
Mr. Shilak Ram Hooda, Advocate for the respondent.
*****B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)**

[1] Learned counsel appearing for the respondent states that in compliance of order, Annexure P/1 dated 09.04.2019 in CWP No.9501 of 2019, the claim of the petitioner as filed before the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Farrukh Nagar, Guguram was considered and rejected vide order, Annexure R/2 dated 30.12.2019 and copy of the reply has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner and acknowledgement in respect thereto is on the index of the reply, which is already on record. Learned counsel contends that in view of order, Annexure R/2 dated 30.12.2019, order, Annexure P/1 dated 09.04.2019 has been complied with, therefore, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondent.

[2] None is present on behalf of the petitioner, despite the case having been called out on second call.

[3] I have considered the submissions of learned counsel appearing for the respondent and perused the record.

[4] Admittedly, order, Annexure R/2 dated 30.12.2019 has been passed rejecting the claim of the petitioner on the ground that she was not eligible to claim benefit as per the scheme. In the circumstances, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondent. However, the petitioner is granted liberty to challenge order, Annexure R/2 dated 30.12.2019 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law, if so advised. Liberty is also granted to the petitioner to move an application for revival of the contempt petition, if cause survives.

[5] Contempt petition disposed of with the aforementioned terms.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

08.08.2022
'Amit'

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