

Raj Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

J. Ganesan

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Mohit, Advocate for
Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. N.S. Behgal, AAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1 dated 14.07.2021 in CWP No.12663 of 2021 in case titled as Raj Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CWP No.12663 of 2021 was disposed of by directing the respondent to decide the legal notice served by the petitioners within three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and in case it was found that the petitioners were entitled to the relief sought, necessary benefits be granted to them but if they were not found entitled to the relief sought or there was any legal impediment to the grant of the same, then a reasoned order be passed and communicated to the petitioners.

[3] Learned AAG has filed reply along with copy of order, Annexure R/1 dated 16.05.2022/01.06.2022 as well as copy of speaking

order Annexure R/2 dated 21.06.2022/24.06.2022 partly accepting the claim of the petitioners. The same are taken on record. Copies thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners, who on perusal of the same states that in the circumstances, the petitioners are not interested in pursuing the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same with liberty to challenge orders, Annexure R/1 and Annexure R/2 to the extent the same deny the relief claimed.

[4] In view of the position noted above, as well as the 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.

[5] Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

15.07.2022
'Amit'

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