

COCp-729-2019

Date of Decision :28.09.2022

NARINDER KUMAR AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Versus

RAVI PRAKASH GUPTA

....Respondent

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

Present : None for the petitioners.
Mr. Arshad Ai, Advocate for
Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate for the respondent.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1, dated 26.09.2018 in CWP No.24671 of 2018.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CWP No.24671 of 2018 was disposed of by directing the Chief Administrator, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Panchkula to consider and decide the claim of the petitioners as contained in representation dated 01.05.2015 by a reasoned order within four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[3] Leaned counsel appearing for the respondent refers to speaking order Annexure R/1 dated 25.02.2020 as per which the claim of the petitioners was rejected on account of the Zonal Oustees Screening Committee held on 07.08.2009 having decided eligibility of the petitioners for allotment of 10 marlas plot whereupon the petitioners were allotted plot No.604, Sector 13, Bahadurgarh through draw of lots which

was sold by the petitioners to Smt. Anita Aggarwal on 06.09.2010,

therefore, the petitioners had already been allotted the above said plot under the oustees quota. Accordingly, representation followed by the subsequent reminders filed by the petitioners were decided by holding that the petitioners had no locus standi/right to apply under the oustees policy dated 11.08.2016 as modified on 08.05.2018 for allotment of plot under oustees quota in future as the benefits under the oustee policy could be availed only once. The said reply is stated to have already been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners. However, none is present on behalf of the petitioners nor has any request for adjournment or pass-over received.

[4] In the light of the position noted above, I am of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by adjourning the matter as order Annexure P/1 dated 26.09.2018 in CWP No.24671 of 2018 has been complied by passing speaking order, Annexure R/1 dated 25.02.2020.

[5] Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioners to challenge speaking order, Annexure R/1 dated 25.02.2020 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law, if so warranted.

[6] Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

28.09.2022

'Amit'

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