



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

**COC-1460-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 26.09.2025**

Amar Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Renu Sogan

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Chawariya, Advocate, and
Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the respondent.


VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner alleges willful disobedience of the directions issued vide order dated 15.11.2023, passed in CWP-18799-2020 (Annexure P-1):

“... After we had heard the matter at length, learned counsel for the parties reached a consensus that let this petition be disposed of, at this stage, to enable the appropriate/competent authority to revisit the matter in issue and pass necessary orders dealing with concerns/grievances of the petitioner as sought to be raised in this petition. It is urged that petitioner shall also be afforded an opportunity of hearing before any such orders are passed.

However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the authorities be directed to pass the necessary orders within a specified time.

In response, learned counsel for the respondents submits that appropriate orders, as indicated above shall be passed within a period of 03



months from today. The petitioner shall also be entitled to supplement his claim by furnishing any fresh material/evidence in this regard within a period of 01 week from today.

In the wake of above, the petition is accordingly disposed of in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the respective parties.”

2. Notice of motion in the instant conempt petition was issued vide order dated 29.04.2024, after which it appears that the matter could not be taken up for hearing.

3. Today, a status report by way of affidavit of the Administrator, HSVP, Gurugram, has been filed in Court, which is taken on record. As per the same, in deference to the directions issued by the Division Bench, speaking order dated 19.06.2024 (Annexure R-1) was passed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner never received a copy of the speaking order and that it is only for the first time, along with the reply, it has been annexed.

4.1. Be that as it may, learned counsel submits that in view of the speaking order passed by the concerned authority, the petitioner does not wish to press the instant contempt petition and, if so advised, he shall avail all such remedies as shall be admissible in law against the said order.

5. Accordingly, in terms of the statement given by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present contempt petition is dismissed as having not been pressed.

6. Rule is discharged.

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

**(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge**

September 26, 2025

Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No