

(109) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. **COCP-2398-2021**
Date of Decision :05.05.2022

Gagandeep Kaur ...Petitioner

Versus

V.K. Meena and anotherRespondents

2. **COCP-2401-2021**

Komalpreet Kaur ...Petitioner

Versus

V.K. Meena and anotherRespondents

3. **COCP-2413-2021**

Pawandeep Kaur ...Petitioner

Versus

V.K. Meena and anotherRespondents

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

Present : Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, Advocate for
Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, AAG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] This order shall decide COCP No.2398, 2401 and 2413 of
2021.

[2] Facts of the case are being taken from COCP No.2398 of
2021.

[3] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiating action against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/2 dated 05.07.2021 in CWP No.8503 of 2018.

[4] Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that CWP No.8503 of 2018 was disposed of vide order, Annexure P/2 dated 05.07.2021 by directing re-measurement of the height of the petitioner(s) in terms of the decision in CWP No.23875 of 2016 in case titled as Sonu Singh vs. State of Haryana and Others.Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the instant petition was filed on account of the failure of the respondents to do the needful in terms of order Annexure P/2 dated 05.07.2021 in CWP No.8503 of 2018.

[5] Reply along with Annexure R/1 has been filed on behalf of respondent No.2.

[6] Learned AAG on the basis of reply as well as Annexure R/1 contends that there is no change in the height of the petitioner(s), consequently, there is no change in the total marks awarded to the petitioner(s) pursuant to re-measurement of the height of the petitioner(s) via digital stadiometer,resultantly, the petitioner(s) do not fall in the selection zone. Copy of reply has already been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioner(s), who in view of order, Annexure R/1 contends that in view of re-measurement of the height of the petitioner as 5'5.47" with a digital stadiometer as against the previous 5'5", resultantly, the petitioner not falling in the selection zone, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition but prays for liberty to

way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[7] The same is not opposed to by the learned AAG.

[8] In view of the position noted above as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner(s), the instant petition(s) is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioner(s), as prayed for.

[9] Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

05.05.2022
'Amit'

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