

2024:PHHC:108604



145      **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**COCP-2846-2024**  
**Decided on:-22.08.2024**

Kirpal Singh      ....Petitioner..

vs.

Ravinder Singh, Managing Director, PRTC      ....Respondent.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present:      Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhilaksh Gaind, Standing Counsel with  
Mr. Rakesh K.Roy, Advocate,  
for the respondent-PRTC.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)**

1.              By way of present petition filed under Section 10 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, prayer has been made for issuance of contempt proceedings against the respondent on account of alleged non-compliance of order dated 29.11.2023 passed by this Court in CWP-24693-2023. The operative part thereof is extracted hereunder:-

“In view of the pleadings in the present petition, without expressing *any opinion on the merits of the case or the claim being made by the petitioner in the legal notice dated 10.10.2022 (Annexure P-5), respondent No.2 is directed to decide the aforesaid legal notice by passing a speaking order within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order with a further direction that if the petitioner is found to be entitled to the claim mentioned in the abovesaid legal notice, necessary*

*disbursement of funds shall be made to the petitioner within a period of 8 weeks thereafter.”*

2. In response, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that the speaking order has already been passed on the representation submitted by the petitioner and the payment due towards him shall be released within a period of two weeks from today.

3. In view of the aforesaid stand taken by the learned counsel representing the respondent, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition.

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 any eventuality wherein, the petitioner seeks revival on account of inaction of the respondent, 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 discharged.

4. Disposed of accordingly.

22.08.2024  
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)  
JUDGE

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