

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

COCN No.506 of 2021
Date of Decision : 02.03.2022

Sohan Singh ...Petitioner

versus

Bharat Bhushan Bharti and anotherRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Karan Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.
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 Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is for initiating action against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 05.02.2020 in CWP No. 36672 of 2019.

[3] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No. 36672 of 2019 was disposed of vide order dated 05.02.2020 by directing the respondents to take follow-up action on the result of the petitioner for the post of Lower Division Clerk in UHBVNL in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, preferably within 04 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[4] Learned counsel contends that as per order (Annexure R-2/1) attached along with the reply, claim of the petitioner for appointment on the post of Lower Division Clerk in UHBVNL has been rejected on

petitioner is not interested in pursuing the contempt petition and the same may be disposed of as such, while granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge order (Annexure R-2/1) by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

[5] Learned DAG also states that in the light of the position noted above, the contempt petition be disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

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

[7] Admittedly, vide order (Annexure R-2/1), the respondents have considered and rejected the claim of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Lower Division Clerk in UHBVNL on account of his ineligibility.

[8] Accordingly, in the light 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, while granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge order (Annexure R-2/1) by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

[9] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

02.03.2022
'Rajneesh'

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