

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

[1] COCP No.417 of 2021
Date of Decision :09.09.2022

Ravi Kumar ...Petitioner
versus

Arun Alagappan and anotherRespondents

[2] COCP No.420 of 2021

Ravi Kumar ...Petitioner
versus

Arun Alagappan and anotherRespondents

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

Present : None for the petitioner.
Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate for the respondents.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in thepetition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 26.02.2020, in CWP No.716 of 2019 and CWP No.32315 of 2019 both titled as '**Ravi Kumar and others**versus**The Regional Director, Reserve Bank of India and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order dated 26.02.2020 in the aforementioned two writ petitions reveals that since the matter had been amicably settled, the petitioner would withdraw all the cases which had been filed against the respondent-bank within 02 weeks, while the Bank was directed to refund the amount to the auction-purchaser along with interest.

[3] Learned counsel for the respondents has produced copy of order dated 21.02.2022 in RA-CW No.112 of 2020 in CWP No.32315 of 2019 as well as RA-CW No.114 of 2020 in CWP No.716 of 2019 and

refers to the operative part of the order, which reads as under:-

“Accordingly, both RA-CW No.112 of 2020 and RA-CW No.114 of 2020 are allowed’ the order dated 26.02.2020 in CWP No.716 of 2019 and CWP No.32315 of 2019 is set aside; both the Writ Petitions stand restored to the file of this Court; and it may be listed before the Bench having provision as per roster after obtaining suitable orders from Hon’ble the Chief Justice. No Costs. ”

[4] A perusal of the same reveals that the review petitions were allowed and both the writ petitions restored to the file of the Court with a direction for listing of the same before the Bench as per roster after obtaining suitable orders from Hon’ble the Chief Justice.

[5] Learned counsel contends that in the circumstances, the instant petitions have become infructuous and may be disposed of as such.

[6] None is present on behalf of the petitioner.

[7] Orders of Hon’ble the Division Bench in the aforementioned review petitions dated 21.02.2021 are taken on record.

[8] In view of the position noted above, no useful purpose would be served by adjourning the matter. Accordingly, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application for revival, if cause subsists.

[9] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

09.09.2022