



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218

COC-1213-2025

Date of Decision: 31.10.2025

Vasdev Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Chander Shekhar Khare, IAS

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Rishab Garg, Advocate
Ms. Niyati Dhiman, Advocate for
Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Sandhu, Advocate for
Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate
for respondent-HSVP.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 01.05.2023 passed by this Court in CWP-25931-2018.
2. The relevant portion of order dated 01.05.2023 passed by this Court in CWP-25931-2018 is reproduced as under:-

“In the light of the assertions as made by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, we dispose of the present writ petition without going into merits of the case or commenting thereon by directing the Chief Administrator Haryana Shahari Vikas Pradhikaran respondent No.1 to consider the representation of the



petitioner dated 10.09.2018 (Annexure P-12) and take a decision thereon sympathetically as the OTS Scheme had come into force and extended during the pendency of the writ petition. The decision be taken within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Decision so taken be conveyed to the petitioner forthwith.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondent contends that in compliance of order dated 01.05.2023 passed by this Court in CWP-25931-2018, compliance affidavit of Naveen Kumar, Estate Office, HSVP, Faridabad, dated 01.04.2025 along with Annexures R-1 (speaking order) and R-2 (forwarding letter) has already been filed.

4. Despite the fact that speaking order dated 03.12.2024 has already been passed, still the petitioner has filed the present contempt petition which is not even maintainable.

5. Accordingly, this Court was going to impose cost upon the petitioner for filing such kind of frivolous contempt petition but because of repeated requests made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the cost was not imposed.

6. In view of the above, the present contempt petition is **dismissed**.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

September 31st 2025

Sahil

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No