

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

102+206

CM Nos.13053-CII, 13838-CII of 2016 and
COCP No.2319 of 2014

Date of Decision: July 22, 2016

Vilayati Ram

...Petitioner

Versus

Ashok Kumar Tripathi and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Ms. Savita Bhandari, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Sethi, Mr. Sachin Gupta, Mr. Tushar Gera and
Mr. Gaurav Kamboj, Advocates
for the applicants-respondents.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

CM No.13053-CII of 2016

Prayer in this application is for permission to place on record
the reply on behalf of respondent No.1.

Application is allowed.

Reply filed on behalf of respondent No.1 is taken on record
subject to just exceptions.

CM No.13838-CII of 2016

Prayer in this application is for permission to place on record
the reply on behalf of respondent No.2.

Application is allowed.

Reply filed on behalf of respondent No.2 is taken on record
subject to just exceptions.

COCP No.2319 of 2014

The petitioner has approached this Court with a grievance that the order dated 13.01.2010 passed by this Court in *CWP No.460 of 2010* titled as *Vilayati Ram Versus Union of India and others* which was disposed of by this Court with a direction to Director of Income Tax Investigation North West Region to respond to the petitioner in pursuance to the request letter dated 20.10.2009, which he had made, in accordance with law within three months from the date of receipt of copy of the order, has not been complied with.

In the reply which has been filed, reference has been made by the counsel for the respondent to Annexure R-1 dated 28.05.2010 which is a response given to the petitioner in compliance with the order passed by this Court in the writ petition referred to above. According to the said information, in six of the cases, he had already been given the due rewards and for the other cases qua which the petitioner had made the claim asserting himself to be the informer, documentary evidence, if any, to substantiate his claim was called upon which according to the department has not been responded to, although this aspect is disputed by the counsel for the petitioner. Reference has also been made in the affidavit to a subsequent letter which was addressed by the counsel for the petitioner which was also responded to vide letter bearing F. No.DIT/Inv./Chd./Reward/Misc./23/2012-13/1348 dated 18.12.2012 (Annexure P-8). In the said communication also, further information was sought for from the petitioner.

In view of the above facts, the present contempt petition would

not survive as the orders passed by this Court have been duly complied with and, therefore, the same stands disposed of.

Petitioner, if aggrieved or has any other claim beyond what has been granted by the respondents to him, may avail of the remedy in accordance with law, if so advised.

Rule discharged.

July 22, 2016
Puneet

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**