

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

1. COCP-2004-2018 (O&M)**Jaideep Ghai****...Petitioner****Versus****Gulshan Rai Satija and another****...Respondents****2. COCP-3347-2018 (O&M)****Anil Kumar****...Petitioners****Versus****Gulshan Rai Satija and another****...Respondents****Date of decision: 14.02.2023****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present:- Mr. Akhil Ahuja, Advocate for
Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vineet Sehgal, Advocate
for the respondents.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

This common order shall dispose of above mentioned two contempt petitions as they are similar in nature.

Prayer in these petitions is for initiating contempt proceedings against the respondents for violating the order dated 06.11.2015, passed by this Court in CP No. 200 of 2015.

Petitioner Jaideep Ghai is respondent No. 3 in the said petition and petitioner Anil Kumar is respondent No. 4.

While issuing notice to respondent No. 1 only i.e. M/s Umesh Developers Private Ltd., the respondent-company was restrained from alienating its immoveable properties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that respondent Nos. 2 to 5 are the Directors of respondent No.1-company and they have violated the aforesaid order by alienating the properties.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that respondent No. 1, against whom the said interim order was passed, has entered into a settlement with Virender Gandhi and on the basis of the same, the said CP No. 200 of 2015 was disposed of with a clear observation that all the interim orders shall stand vacated.

The contempt petition, filed by Virender Gandhi i.e. COCP-1398-2018, stands dismissed as withdrawn today itself in terms of the said order, however, learned counsel for the petitioners still alleges violation of the order dated 06.11.2015 that respondent No. 1 has sold the property and the same has affected the right of the petitioners, who are the Directors of the said company.

The petitioners, being respondent Nos. 3 and 4, respectively, were duly represented by their counsel in the said company petition, however, they did not set up any claim that they have an independent right and the compromise effected between Virender Gandhi and respondent No. 1-company is not binding on their right.

Accordingly, the arguments raised by learned counsel for the petitioners in this regard do not survive.

Accordingly, the present petitions are dismissed.

Rule stands discharged.

14.02.2023

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No