

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

COCN No.457 of 2022

Date of Decision : 25.04.2022

Jaspal Singh and another ...Petitioners

versus

Parneet Kaur, Block Development and Panchayat
Officer-cum-Executive Officer, Panchayat Samiti,
Dera Bassi, Distt. SAS Nagar, Mohali and anotherRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. J.S. Bhandohal, Advocate for the respondents.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating action against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-6) dated 30.09.2010 in CWP No.16299 of 2010 in case titled as 'Ajaib Singh and others versus The Director Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab and others'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-6) reveals that CWP No.16299 of 2010 was disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to approach the Gram Panchayat for purchase of the land by filing an appropriate application in accordance with law by observing that in case the application was filed within 01 month, the same be considered and decided by the Gram Panchayat within two months thereafter and that dispossession of the petitioners would remain stayed during the aforementioned period.

[3] Learned counsel contends that although order

months of the receipt of application in terms of order dated 30.09.2010 yet no decision was taken on the same and it was only vide Annexure P-10, that the respondents required the petitioner to submit a fresh application on account of non receipt of any application.

[4] Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has filed reply along with Annexure R-1 dated 17.02.2022, rejecting the claim of the petitioners.

[5] Learned counsel for the petitioners on perusal of the same states that the petitioners do not press the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same with liberty to challenge order dated 17.02.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[6] In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, but without expressing any opinion regarding delay and laches qua the claim in terms of order dated 30.09.2010 or the maintainability of the instant petition, the instant petition is *disposed* of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Needless to mention, the petitioner would be at liberty to seek redress qua his grievance in accordance with law and the observations made hereinabove.

[7] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

25.04.2022
'Rajneesh'