

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

**COCP No.1061 of 2014**

**Date of Decision :28.4.2014**

Punjab Technical University

....Petitioner

Versus

Inderbir Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

....

Present: Mr.Puneet Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

.....

**MAHESH GROVER.J.**

Before the writ court a Public Interest Litigation had been preferred by respondent No.3 alleging serious irregularities in the appointments and other functional aspects of Punjab Technical University, Kapurthala. The writ court directed the newly constituted Board of Governors to look into all the allegations made in the writ petition and take an appropriate decision within a period of three months from the date of passing of the order i.e. 1.10.2013. The Punjab Technical University now in the instant contempt petition is alleging that despite the directions given by the writ court respondent has gone on, to lodge a complaint with the police authorities on a similar cause and, therefore this amounts to contempt as this should be construed to be an attempt to overreach the court.

I have duly considered the matter agitated before this Court in the instant petition and am unable to persuade myself to intervene. Merely because respondent No.3 has approached the police authorities resulting in somewhat duplicity of the proceedings would not be an occasion for this Court to presume that an attempt to overreach the court has been made. It

may be a totally misconceived remedy availed of by respondent No.3 for which the petitioner would have appropriate remedy in law, but under no circumstances can this be construed to be a situation warranting the interference of this court under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act. The petition is totally misconceived and has resulted in sheer wastage of time of the court. Apart from this the memorandum of parties indicates that SSP, Kapurthala and SP(D), Phagwara had been impleaded as party respondents. Even if the best case of the petitioner is accepted, these two respondents have nothing to do with the allegations of either overreaching the court or for that purpose doing an act which would invite proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

28.4.2014  
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)  
JUDGE