



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

101

COCP-2773-2025

Date of Decision: 09.07.2025

Tarun

...Petitioner

Versus

Arvind Rai, DIG, GCC, CRPF Pinjore

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present:- Mr. Rahul Rampal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VIKAS SURI, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, alleging non-compliance and wilful disobedience of the order dated 05.02.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by this Court in CWP-3241-2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had filed a writ petition for setting aside the selection/final merit list of selection of candidates under recruitment of meritorious sport persons category specifically under 70 kg. wrestling freestyle, which was appended as Annexure P-5 with the writ petition. At the time of preliminary hearing before the writ Court, learned counsel for the writ petitioner submitted that he would be satisfied in case the respondents to the writ petition are directed to take a decision on the claim of the writ petitioner for seeking appointment to the post in a time bound manner. The said writ petition was disposed of



vide order dated 05.02.2025, the operative part of which reads as under:-

“2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied at this juncture, in case the respondents are directed to take a decision on the claim of the petitioner for seeking appointment to the said post in a time bound manner.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Indresh Goel, Senior Panel Counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that he has no objection if the aforesaid prayer is accepted.

5. Accordingly, with the consent of the parties and without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of and respondents are directed to take a decision on the claim of the petitioner for seeking appointment to the said post and to pass a reasoned and speaking order thereupon in accordance with law preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. Needless to mention that in case the claim of the petitioner for appointment against the said post is found to be valid and sustainable, the further process be undertaken within a further period of one month.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite passing of the aforesaid order by this Court, the respondents to the writ petition have wilfully not complied with the said order.

4. The memo of parties of the writ petition was not placed on record of the present petition and in order to verify as to against which respondent the aforesaid direction had been issued by the Writ Court, learned counsel for the petitioner had sought time to verify the same. Hence,



he was directed to placed on record the memo of parties of CWP-3241-2025.

5. As per office report, the said memo of parties had been placed on record. A perusal thereof would show that only the hereunder mentioned respondents were arrayed as respondents to the writ petition:-

1. Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, Cabinet Secretariat, Raisina Hill, New Delhi.
2. Directorate General Central Reserve Police Force, Ministry of Home Affairs, Pragati Vihar, New Delhi-110003.
3. Inspector Bhagwan Singh, Comdt. (IRLA No.4887) GC, JDR, Presiding Officer, (PST/DV Board for Rectt. Of CT (GD) under sports quoa-2024 at GC, CRPF, Pinjore.

6. The present contempt petition has been filed against Arvind Rai, DIG, GCC, CRPF, Pinjore-134104. A perusal of the aforesaid memo of parties would show that he was not even impleaded as a respondent in the writ petition and as such, no direction was issued to the said respondent.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has strenuously maintain that the same would not make any difference, even if he was not arrayed as a respondent in the writ petition, wherein the aforesaid directions were issued as the respondent impleaded in the instant petition is the appointing authority and he would be still duty bound to comply with the aforesaid order.

8. The said contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is misconceived and untenable in law. A perusal of the record would further



show that no material has been placed on record to show as to when the certified copy of the said order was served upon or received by the respondent in the instant petition.

9. In view of the aforesaid, the present contempt petition against a respondent, who was not a party to the writ petition wherein the order alleged to have been violated has been passed or the same is shown to have been communicated, would not be maintainable.

10. Resultantly, the contempt petition is dismissed.

July 09, 2025

harish

**(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No