

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

1. COCP-1902-2016 (O&M)

Poonam ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

2. COCP-2275-2016 (O&M)

Rajesh Malik ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

3. COCP-2435-2016 (O&M)

Manish Kumar and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

4. COCP-2502-2016 (O&M)

Shiv @ Shivi Sajdeh ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

5. COCP-2253-2016 (O&M)

Ranbir Singh and others ...Petitioners

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

6. COCP-2254-2016 (O&M)

Sudesh ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

7. COCP-3046-2016 (O&M)

Jagdeep Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

8. COCP-1986-2016 (O&M)

Jagdish and another ...Petitioners

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

9. COCP-1806-2016 (O&M)

Naresh Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

10. COCP-1533-2016 (O&M)

Karan Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Vikas Gupta and others ...Respondents

Date of decision : 07.07.2023

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Ajit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate
for the respondents.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that these contempt petitions may be disposed of in terms of order dated 21.05.2018, passed by this Court in COCP-1505-2016, vide which, the following order was

passed:

“...This is an application praying that the petition be disposed of in terms of judgment delivered in Rajiv Manchanda and others Vs. Haryana Urban Development Authority and another, CWP No.22252 of 2016, decided on 22.11.2017. Mr. Balyan, who is present in court, at the outset submits that there is no dispute with the ratio of the aforesaid judgment and a policy dated 8.5.2018 has been formulated in view of the same. If petitioner's case falls in the same, he would be considered. In view of statement made by Mr. Balyan, this petition is disposed of.”

Accordingly, the present petitions are disposed of.

Rule stands discharged.

The petitioners are granted liberty to avail the alternative remedy, in accordance with law, if so advised.

Let a photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

07.07.2023
Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No