

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

COCp-1114-2021

Date of Decision : 08.02.2022

Parmod Sharma ...Petitioner

versus

Ajoy Kumar SinhaRespondent

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

Present : Mr. Rajinder Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Maloo Chahal, DAG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

[1] Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

[2] Prayer in the petition under Sections 11 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, is for initiating proceedings against the respondent on account of intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 16.01.2020 in CWP No.1049 of 2020 in case titled as 'Parmod Sharma versus State of Punjab and another.'

[3] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) dated 16.01.2020 reveals that CWP No.1049 of 2020 was disposed of by directing the respondent to decide representation dated 04.09.2019 submitted by the petitioner by passing a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[4] Learned DAG refers to order (Annexure R-1/1) dated 19.05.2020 attached along with the reply filed by the respondent, as per which representation dated 04.09.2019 has been decided and the claim of

[5] Learned DAG contends that in view of orders dated 16.01.2020 in CWP No.1049 of 2020 having been complied with, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondent.

[6] In the light of the position noted above, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the contempt petition and the same may be disposed of, as such.

[7] I have considered the submission of learned counsel for the parties.

[8] Admittedly, orders (Annexure R-1/1) dated 19.05.2020 have been passed by the respondent in compliance of orders dated 16.01.2020 in CWP No.1049 of 2020 and the claim of the petitioner has been accepted.

[9] In the light of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, no action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondent.

[10] Accordingly, the contempt petition is *disposed of*, as such.

[11] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

08.02.2022
'Rajneesh'

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