



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

COCP-3448-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 20.11.2025

Sanjiv Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

Gurkirat Kirpal Singh and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Rajinder Kumar Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shiny Chopra, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amaninder Preet, Advocate,
for respondents No.4 & 5.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The instant contempt petition has been preferred under Sections 10 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, alleging willful disobedience of order dated 26.07.2023 (Annexure P-2), passed in CWP-15892-2023.

2. CWP-15892-2023 was instituted by one M/s Udey Rice and Agro Mill assailing the decision of the respondents therein, vide which the claim of the petitioner in the said petition for equal distribution of paddy in ratio and proportion was declined:-

“5. This Court, in view of expiry of Kharif Marketing Season 2022-23, finds it appropriate to dispose of the present petition, without commenting upon merits of the case, however, directs District Allotment Committee and other procuring agencies to allocate paddy in future, in proportionate to allotment where lesser quantity of paddy is available.”



3. The grievance of the petitioner is that for the Kharif season 2023-24, the directions were not adhered to and paddy was not allocated in terms of the said directions as well as the applicable policy.

4. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even for the year 2024-25, the allocation has not been made in accordance with the policy.

5. In the reply submitted by the District Manager, MARKFED, Mansa, it has been stated that 100% storage has been completed in the petitioner's Mill. Storage report dated 05.12.2023 has been placed on record as **Annexure R-5**.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any document to the contrary. However, he has agitated about allocation for the year 2024-25, which, in any case, is not the subject matter of the instant contempt petition.

7. In view of the above, there does not appear to be any willful disobedience of the directions passed by the writ Court.

8. The instant contempt petition is accordingly dismissed.

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

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

November 20, 2025

Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No