

Geet Mittal and others

...Petitioners

versus

Krishan Kumar

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Ms. Tanisha, Advocate for
Mr. Vinay Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Rishu Madan, AAG, Punjab.

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 23.01.2018, in CWP-1385-2018.

2. A perusal of order Annexure P-1 reveals that CWP-1385-2018, was disposed of vide order dated 23.01.2018, by directing the respondent to consider and decide legal notice/representation dated 11.12.2017, by passing a speaking order within six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case the competent authority was of the view that the relief claimed by the petitioners was not made out, a speaking order was required to be passed in respect thereto.

3. Learned AAG, Punjab, refers to order Annexure R/1 dated 17.01.2020, as per which, claim of some of the petitioners has been rejected while claim of the remaining petitioners has been accepted.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that in view of order

Annexure R/1, she does not press the instant petition but prays for grant of liberty to challenge order Annexure R/1 dated 17.01.2020, to the extent the same denies relief to some of the petitioners, by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

5. In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioners, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to petitioner Nos.3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 23, 24, 26 and 27, to challenge order Annexure R/1 dated 17.01.2020, by way of appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law.

6. Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

28.09.2022

rajesh

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