

[107] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No.80 of 2020

Date of Decision :27.09.2022

Sohan Lal and another

...Petitioners

versus

Rajeev Arora, Addl. Chief Secretary,
Govt. of Haryana and another

....Respondents

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

Present : None for the petitioners.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Longia, DAG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 30.04.2018, in CWP No.10618 of 2018 in case titled as '**Sohan Lal and another**versus**State of Haryana and others**'.

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No.10618 of 2018 was disposed of vide order dated 30.04.2018, with a direction to the Civil Surgeon-cum-District Malaria Officer, Karnal, to look into the grievances of the petitioners in the light of Scheme dated 07.05.1991 and in case, the same was still applicable, to take a decision for re-engaging the petitioners regard being had to the decision in the cases of Balbir and Ram Sarup.

[3] Learned DAG, Haryana, refers to compliance report dated 28.01.2021, as also to Annexure R-1 i.e. speaking order dated 03.07.2018 and Annexure R-2 i.e. copy of dispatch register dated 04.07.2018 and on the basis of the same contends that vide order Annexure R-1, the claim of

the petitioners was considered but was rejected on account of the same not being as per the policy framed by the Government and that copy of decision (Annexure R-1) was forwarded to the petitioners by registered post (Annexure R-2). Copy of the compliance report is stated to have been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioners.

[4] However, none is present on behalf of the petitioners, nor has any request for adjournment or pass over been received, therefore, in the circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petition pending.

[5] Accordingly, in the light 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, while granting liberty to the petitioners to challenge order (Annexure R-1) dated 03.07.2018 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law. Liberty is also granted to the petitioners to move an application for revival of the instant petition, if cause survives.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

27.09.2022

'Rajneesh'

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>