

2024:PHHC:115014

120 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARHCOCP-1757-2024
Decided on:-03.09.2024

Kehar Singh and othersPetitioners..

VS.

Sh. Anurag Jain, Secretary, Road Traffic and National
Highways Department and othersRespondents.**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. Raj Karan Singh Verka, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Rishi Kaushal, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG, Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Sections 10 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, prayer has been made for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents on account of alleged non-compliance of order dated 29.05.2014 passed by this Court in CWP-10953-2014. The operative part thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with a direction to respondent No.3 that let this petition be treated as application on behalf of the petitioners under Sections 23 and 28 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 read with National Highways Act, 1956 and their claim regarding grant of solatium and interest be determined within a period of three months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. The amount found due shall then be

released by respondent Nos.1 & 2 within a period of one month thereafter”.

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 submits that the dispute only relates to payment of interest from 08.01.2016 till 03.11.2017 and in case, the petitioners provide the calculation, the payment shall be released to them within a period of two weeks from today.

3. In view of the aforesaid stand taken by the learned State counsel representing respondents No.1 and 2, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he does not want to press the present petition as the petitioners would furnish calculations within a period of two days from today.

4. Disposed of accordingly.

However, the petitioner would be at liberty to seek revival, in case the needful is not done within the aforementioned stipulated period. It is made clear that in an eventuality wherein, the petitioners seek revival on account of inaction of the respondents, the concerned officer would be liable to pay a sum of Rs.1 lakh as costs from his/her own pocket in favour of the petitioner.

Rule stands discharged.

03.09.2024

sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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