



105

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

COCP-5367-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 20.01.2026

M/S JAI SHIV RICE MILLS

.... Petitioner

VERSUS

ANSHAJ SINGH & ANR

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Panwar, Addl. AG Haryana for respondent No.1.

Mr. R.K. Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate for respondent No.2.**ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for violation of the order dated 19.10.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by this Court in CWP-22274-2023 titled as 'M/s Jai Shiv Rice Mills and Others Versus State of Haryana and others'.

2. On 16.01.2026 the following order was passed :

'A written request for an adjournment has been circulated on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that he is in personal difficulty.

Learned State counsel appearing for respondent No.1 as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have a

serious objection to the adjournment on the ground that the writ petition which was filed by the petitioner was CWP No.22274 of 2023, wherein the petitioner herein was petitioner No.1 and qua him the said writ petition was dismissed as having been rendered infructuous as it had been stated by the counsel representing the petitioner therein that the paddy had already been allotted. Learned counsel have further pointed out that the present contempt petition has been filed relying on an order dated 15.09.2023 (Annexure P-1), which is not even the order passed in CWP-22274-2023, rather it is an order passed in CWP-20143-2023 relating to State of Punjab. Both the counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents have further stated that replies have already been filed by them and have pointed out as to how the petitioner herein has misled the Court.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 20.01.2026.

It is made clear that no further adjournment shall be granted on any account.

To be shown in the urgent list. '

3. Today learned counsel for the petitioner states that though for the year 2023-24 paddy was allotted to the petitioner, however, in the subsequent years the paddy had not been allotted.

4. A perusal of the order dated 19.10.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by this Court in CWP-22274-2023 reveals that there is no such direction issued by this Court that in the subsequent years also the paddy would be allotted to the petitioner in the manner as stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. In view of the above, no ground is made out to entertain the present contempt petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

20.01.2026
Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

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