

Naresh

...Petitioner

versus

Rajeev Ranjan

....Respondent

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

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. At the outset, learned AAG, Haryana, on instructions from Mr. Gulab Singh, Tehsildar, Rohtak, contends that directions in order Annexure P/1 in CWP-15063-2022, were to the District Magistrate, Rohtak, Teshildar Rohtak as well as one M/s Equitas Small Finance Bank Ltd., whereas the petitioner has impleaded the Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak as respondent, therefore the petition against the respondent is misconceived since neither was any direction issued to the Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak nor the Commissioner, Rohtak Division, Rohtak, in any manner committed violated order Annexure P/1.

2. Learned AAG, Haryana, further contends that in addition to the aforementioned submission, the petitioner never deposited any payment in terms of order Annexure P/1, within the stipulated period of time as was allowed by Hon'ble the Division Bench, therefore, no action was called for against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

3. It needs noticing her that on 01.09.2022, learned counsel for

the petitioner had requested for an adjournment to file additional affidavit of the petitioner, whereupon the case was adjourned to 20.09.2022. On 20.09.2022, counsel for the petitioner requested for more time to comply with order dated 01.09.2022, whereupon the matter was adjourned to 01.11.2022, on which date, none appeared on account of lawyers abstaining from work due to call given by the Bar Association of this Court, whereupon, the case was adjourned to today. Today, despite the case having been called out twice, none is present on behalf of the petitioner nor has additional affidavit been filed in terms of order dated 01.09.2022.

4. In view of the position noted above, I am of the view that no useful purpose would be served by adjourning the matter. Accordingly, 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 the petitioner to take out appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law, in case of non compliance with order Annexure P/1.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

13.12.2022
rajesh

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