

COCp-938-2022

Date of Decision: 12.05.2022

KULWANT SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

KULJIT PAUL SINGH MAHI

...Respondent

COCp-939-2022

JUGRAJ SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

KULJIT PAUL SINGH MAHI

...Respondent

COCp-940-2022

DHARMINDER SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

KULJIT PAUL SINGH MAHI

...Respondent

COCp-941-2022

JASVIR SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

KULJIT PAUL SINGH MAHI

...Respondent

COCp-942-2022

LAKHWINDER SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

KULJIT PAUL SINGH MAHI

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Sukhdev Kamboj, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

1. This order shall decide COCP-938-2022, COCP-939-2022, COCP-940-2022, COCP-941-2022 and COCP-942-2022, as violation in all the cases is of the same order. Facts of the case are being taken from COCP No.938 of 2022.

2. Prayer in the instant petition is for initiating action against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/2 dated 03.02.2022, in CWP-27116 of 2021.

3. A perusal of order Annexure P/2, reveals that while adjourning the case for 16.05.2022, learned State counsel made a statement that the case of the petitioner would be reconsidered on 14.02.2022 in terms of order dated 07.01.2022.

4. Learned counsel contends that the instant petition was filed on account of failure of the respondent to do the needful in terms of assurance held out before Hon'ble the Writ Court as noted in order Annexure P-2.

5. At first call, learned AAG, Punjab had requested for a pass over to enable him to seek instructions. Now on the basis of instructions from Mr. Dalvinder Singh, Senior Assistant, O/o DPI, learned AAG states that needful could not be done due to administrative exigencies, but in case six weeks time is granted, needful would be done.

6. The same satisfies learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that in the circumstances, he does not press the instant petition but directions be issued to the respondent to adhere to the assurance held out by him through the learned State counsel.

7. In view of the position noted above, no action under the

Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is called for against the respondent(s). Contempt petition is accordingly disposed of as such while directing the respondent to adhere to the assurance held out by him and to do the needful within six weeks from today. Needless to mention, in case the needful is not done within the stipulated period of time, the petitioner would be at liberty to move an application for revival of the contempt petitions. In that eventuality a serious view would be taken in the matter.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

12.05.2022

ps

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