

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

COCN No.465 of 2021

Date of Decision : 02.03.2022

Neelam Sharma and another ...Petitioners

versus

Shatrujeet Kapur and othersRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Joy Preet Meelu, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Tapan Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J.

[1] Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

[2] Prayer in the petition under Article 215 of the Constitution of India read with Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1), dated 04.12.2019 in CWP No.15388 of 2010 in case titled as 'Neelam Sharma versus State of Haryana and others'.

[3] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), dated 04.12.2019 in CWP No.15388 of 2010 reveals that the writ petition was disposed of by directing that in case any representation was filed by the petitioners claiming benefit under Instructions dated 02.08.2019, the same be decided by passing a appropriate speaking order within 03 months from the date of receipt of the representation.

[4] Learned counsel states that pursuant to order (Annexure P-1) dated 04.12.2019 in CWP No.15388 of 2010, representation filed by petitioner No.1 has been decided and appointment offered to petitioner

[5] Learned counsel contends that in the circumstances, the petitioners are not interested in pursuing the instant petition and the same may be disposed of as such.

[6] Learned DAG also states that in view of claim having been decided in favour of the petitioners, the instant petition be disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[7] I have considered the submissions of learned counsel.

[8] Admittedly, petitioner No.2 has been offered appointment pursuant to decision of representation filed by petitioner No.1 in the light of instructions dated 02.08.2019.

[9] In the light of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, no action is called for against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Accordingly, the contempt petition is *disposed of* as such.

[10] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

02.03.2022
'Rajneesh'

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