



COC-987-2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

(103)

COC-987-2026

Date of decision: - 16.04.2026

Zile Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Sudhir Rajpal and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Mannu Singh Sheokand, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. K.C. Meena, PCCF, respondent No.2 (Through VC).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Grover, respondent No.3 in person.

\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)**

1. On 30.03.2026, this Court was pleased to file the following  
order: -

*“Present:- Mr. Mannu Singh Sheokand, Advocate for the petitioner.  
(Through Video Conferencing)*

*Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.*

\*\*\*\*

*On 07.03.2026, this Court had passed the following order:-*

*“Present:- Mr. Mannu Singh Sheokand, Advocate for  
the petitioner.*

*Mr. Raj Partap Singh Brar, AAG, Haryana.*

\*\*\*\*

*Learned State Counsel prays for an adjournment to  
submit compliance report.*

*Adjourned to 30.03.2026.*



COC-987-2026

-2-

*Let compliance report be filed within a period of three weeks from today.*

*To be shown in the urgent list.*

**07.03.2026”**

*Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that even till date, neither the compliance has been done nor compliance report has been submitted.*

*When this Court was about to proceed with the matter, learned State Counsel has submitted that one last opportunity be granted to the respondents-State to submit compliance report.*

*Adjourned to 16.04.2026.*

*In case compliance report is not submitted by the next date of hearing, then, respondent No.3 would appear in person before this Court and respondent No.2 would appear through video conferencing.*

*To be taken up in the urgent list.*

**30.03.2026”**

2. Learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions from respondent No.2, who is present through video conferencing and respondent No.3 who is present in person in Court, has submitted that against the order of learned Single Bench, LPA-983-2026 has been filed and the LPA Bench has granted interim stay on 09.04.2026. It is, however, submitted that the said order is not available. It is stated that in case the said statement is found to be false and the petitioner is required to file an application for revival, then, the respondents are ready to pay an amount of Rs.15,000/- to the petitioner as litigation expenses.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the present contempt petition be disposed of but the respondents be bound by



COC-987-2026

-3-

the statement made before this Court. It is further submitted that after the decision in the above-said LPA, liberty be granted to the petitioner to file a fresh contempt petition in case any cause survives.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present contempt petition is disposed of. The respondents would be bound by the statement made before this Court. It is made clear that in case the petitioner is to file an application for revival on account of the fact that the above-said statement is incorrect, then, as undertaken before this Court, the respondents would pay an amount of Rs.15,000/- to the petitioner as litigation expenses. Liberty, as sought by the petitioner, is also granted.

**April 16, 2026**  
*naresh.k*

**( VIKAS BAHL )**  
**JUDGE**

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