

[101] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No.428 of 2019
Date of Decision :20.04.2022

Naresh Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

Deepak Kumar, Block Development and
Panchayat Officer and othersRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Amandeep Rana, Advocate for
Mr. Vipin Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shilak Ram Hooda, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 17.09.2018 in CWP No.23726 of 2018 in case titled as 'Naresh Kumar versus State of Haryana and others'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No.23726 of 2018 was disposed of by directing the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Rewari to take action required in the matter on the basis of report in inquiry conducted qua allegations of illegal cutting of 12 trees from the cremation grounds by the Sarpanch within 03 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[3] On 04.04.2019, time had been sought by the learned State Counsel to file reply / compliance report but needful was not done. While adjourning the matter on 07.08.2019, it was ordered that in case the needful

remain present in Court and shall also be liable for penalty of Rs.50,000/-.

On 21.01.2020, respondents were granted one last opportunity to file reply, subject to payment of costs of Rs.50,000/-.

[4] Today, the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Khol, District Rewari has filed affidavit along with receipt No.1019 issued by the Punjab and Haryana High Court depositing Rs.50,000/- on 05.03.2020 in terms of order dated 12.03.2020. The same is taken on record.

[5] Learned counsel for respondent No.1 refers to the reply dated 15.02.2020 (attached with CM No.4056 of 2020) filed on behalf of respondent No.1 and states that Rs.12314/- on account of loss regarding falling of trees have already been recovered in terms of action taken by respondent No.1, Annexure R-1 dated 23.08.2019. The reply is taken on record.

[6] Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not wish to pursue the contempt petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same.

[7] In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[8] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

20.04.2022
'Rajneesh'

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