

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

COCN No.597 of 2020
Date of Decision :24.08.2022

Beant Singh ...Petitioner

versus

Sanjay Kumar and othersRespondents

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

Present : Mr. N.S. Gill, Advocate, for
Mr. BS Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ayush Sarna, Asstt. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

(1) Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 25.07.2019, in CWP No.20459 of 2019 in case titled as '**Beant Singh**versus**State of Punjab and others**'.

(2) A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that CWP No.20459 of 2019, was disposed of vide order dated 25.07.2019, by directing the official respondents to decide representations (Annexure P-1 and P-2) dated 20.12.2018 and 12.02.2019 respectively by passing a speaking order within 03 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case, after the decision, the petitioner was found entitled for any monetary benefit, to release the same to him within a period of next three months.

(3) Learned counsel for respondent No.3 has referred to paragraph 4 of the affidavit filed by Surinder Kumar, Executive Officer,

Municipal Council Rampura Phul, District Bathinda, as per which payment of Rs.15,97,691/- was made prior to the passing of the order of this Court whereas payment of Rs.2,29,882/- and Rs.67,809/-, were made vide Cheque No.000476, dated 17.04.2020 and cheque No.000559 dated 19.05.2020 and the aforesaid payment includes interest on account of delay in making payment in view of the decision of Full Bench of this Court in A.S. Randhawa Vs. State of Punjab & ors., 1997(3) SCT 468.

(4) Learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions from the petitioner states that in view of the needful having been done and the judgment of this Court, as contained in Annexure P-1 having been complied with, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same.

(5) 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.

(6) *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

24.08.2022

'monika'

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