

Mamta Devi

...Petitioner

versus

Anil Hooda another

....Respondents

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

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/2, dated 11.09.2018, in CWP-10481-2016.

2. A perusal of order Annexure P/2, reveals that CWP-10481-2016, was disposed of by directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for regularization in view of policy dated 01.10.2003 and 10.02.2004 within four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

3. Learned DAG, Haryana, refers to paragraph No.4 of the affidavit of Dr. Rajesh Vats,, HFS, Divisional Forest Officer (T), Sonapat, to contend that services of the husband of the petitioner were regularized vide order No.73 dated 20.09.2019 and that pursuant thereto pensionary benefits have been granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel contends that in the circumstances, no action

under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, is called for against the respondents. Learned counsel further states that reply dated 26.07.2022, has already been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner. However, none is present on behalf of the petitioner. In the circumstances, it appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition.

5. In view of the position noted above, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

6. Rule discharged. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application for revival of the contempt petition, in case cause survives.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

02.08.2022

rajesh

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