



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

1. Civil Original Contempt Petition No. 421 of 2025

Vikas Rana

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

D. Suresh and Others

... Respondent(s)

AND

2. Civil Original Contempt Petition No. 444 of 2025

Krishna Devi

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

D. Suresh and Others

... Respondent(s)

DATE OF DECISION: 14.02.2025

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Kanwar Abhey Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. These two contempt petitions are listed today for hearing. The petitioners claim that they stood deprived of their land on account of compulsory acquisition of land. The petitioners filed two separate writ petitions which were disposed of with the following observations:-

“Mr. Mittal states that no applications have been invited for allotment of plots under the R&R policy of the State. As and when applications are invited and the petitioner applies in

response to the same, his case would be considered in accordance with law.

In view of the above, instant petition is disposed of.”

2. Subsequently, an application for clarification of the order was filed which was disposed of with the following observations:-

“This Court is sanguine that the respondents, in terms of the statement made in court today shall issue an advertisement as expeditiously as possible for allotment of residential/industrial/commercial plots under the R&R Policy and shall deal with the claims of the applicant in accordance with law.”

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that the respondent-Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited has not issued any advertisement for inviting applications from oustees.

4. This Court has considered the submissions of the learned counsel representing the petitioners.

5. The jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1971 Act”) is required to be invoked only in the extraordinary circumstances particularly when there is willful violation of the directions issued by the Court. The jurisdiction to issue contempt is not the same as of the execution. It is evident that there was no direction by the Court to issue an advertisement within a specified period. The Court only expressed a hope that the advertisement would be issued as expeditiously as possible.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground is made out to issue notice under the ‘1971 Act’. However, the petitioners may avail the alternative remedies.

6. With the observations made above, both the contempt petitions are dismissed.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

February 14, 2025
“DK”

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