

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

COCN No.453 of 2022

Date of Decision :20.09.2022

Baljinder Kumar and others

...Petitioners

versus

Ajoy Sharma, IAS, Principal Secretary, Govt.
of Punjab, Chandigarh and another

....Respondents

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

Present : None for the petitioners.
Mr. Sehajbir Singh Aulakh, Asstt. AG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 13.07.2021, in CWP No.12601 of 2021 in case titled as '**Baljinder Kumar and others** versus **State of Punjab and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No.12601 of 2021 was disposed of by directing the respondents to consider and decide legal notice dated 28.01.2019 served by the petitioners within 04 months by passing a speaking order, in accordance with law.

[3] Learned Asstt. AG, Punjab, refers to order (Annexure R-1) i.e. speaking order dated 24.03.2022 attached to short reply dated 12.07.2022, as per which, the claim of the petitioners as contained in legal notice dated 28.01.2019, has been rejected.

[4] Learned Asstt. AG, Punjab, states that in view of speaking order (Annexure R-1) dated 24.03.2022, order (Annexure P-1) has been

complied with, therefore, no action is called for against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[5] It also needs noticing here that copy of speaking order (Annexure R-1) dated 24.03.2022 had been placed on record on 01.04.2022 and on 14.07.2022 the same was again placed on record along with a short reply, whereupon counsel for the petitioner had requested for an adjournment to go over the same and to argue the case.

[6] Today, none is present on behalf of the petitioners, despite the case having been called out in the pre-lunch session as well as post-lunch session.

[7] In view of the position noted above, no useful purpose would be served by adjourning the case. Accordingly, in the light of the position noted above, 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 speaking order (Annexure R-1) dated 24.03.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

20.09.2022
'Rajneesh'

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>