

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

123

COCN No.273 of 2022

Date of Decision: 25.03.2022

Surinder Kumar Bansal and another

...Petitioners

VERSUS

Ajit Balaji Joshi, IAS and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. Himanshu Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate for respondent No.1.

VIKAS SURI, J. (Oral)

On the last date of hearing, the following order was passed:-

“Instant petition was filed on account of failure of the respondents to comply with order dated 14.10.2021 in CWP No.21299 of 2021 whereby learned State Counsel had assured that matter with regard to acceptance or rejection of the bid of the petitioners of Rs.2,99,55,000/- was pending before the competent authority and final decision would be taken in respect thereto within 04 weeks from 14.10.2021 and decision taken would be conveyed to the petitioners.

On 18.02.2022, Mr. Rajesh Gaur, learned Addl. AG, Haryana, accepted notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and sought time to submit compliance report as well as reply, indicating the reasons for noncompliance with order (Annexure P-1) dated 14.10.2021 in CWP No.21299 of 2021 whereupon the case was adjourned to today.

Today, Mr. Deepak Balyan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 seeks more time to submit compliance report.

Adjourned to 25.03.2022, for submission of compliance report as well as reply, indicating the reasons for non-compliance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 14.10.2021 in CWP No.21299 of 2021, subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to be paid to the petitioners.

To be shown in the list of urgent cases.”

Today, when the matter was taken up for further hearing, at the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the order dated 14.10.2021 passed in CWP No.21299 of 2021 has been complied with and the demand draft towards costs awarded vide order dated 15.03.2022 has also been handed over to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in view of the above, on instructions, he does not wish to press with the contempt petition any further.

Learned counsel for respondent No.1 on the basis of written instructions, affirms the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner and also tenders unconditional apology for the delay that has occurred in the matter, which was neither willful nor intentional.

I have considered the submissions of learned counsels and in view of the order dated 14.10.2021 (Annexure P-1) having been complied with in spirit and the statement of the learned counsel for respondent, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondent.

Contempt petition is accordingly disposed of.

Rule is discharged.

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

March 25, 2022

Sachin M.

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No