

[132] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP No.214 of 2022 (O&M)  
Date of Decision : 22.03.2022

Randhir Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Rajeev Arora, Addl. Chief Secretary to  
Govt. of Haryana and another ....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Mohinder Pal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Longia, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**B.S. Walia, J.**

[1] Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

[2] Prayer in the petition under Sections 10 & 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, is for initiating action against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 16.07.2021 in CWP No.12880 of 2021 in case titled as 'Randhir Singh versus State of Haryana and others.'

[3] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1) reveals that CWP No.12880 of 2021 was disposed of by directing the Director General of Police, Haryana to decide legal notice dated 25.05.2021 by taking a conscious decision thereon by passing a speaking order within 03 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[4] On the previous date, learned DAG, Haryana, had filed copy

of order dated 09.09.2021 passed by the DIG-cum-Superintendent of Police, Hisar. However, in view of objection of counsel petitioner that as per order (Annexure P-1), decision on the legal notice was to be taken by the Director General of Police, Haryana, learned DAG, Haryana, sought time and thereafter has filed reply along with copy of order dated 08.03.2022 passed by the Director General of Police, Haryana in compliance of order (Annexure P-1) dated 16.07.2021 in CWP No.12880 of 2021 in case titled as 'Randhir Singh versus State of Haryana and others.' Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who on perusal thereof states that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not press the instant petition and the same may be disposed of, as such, while granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge order dated 08.03.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[5] In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, while granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge order dated 08.03.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[6] *Rule discharged.*

**(B.S. Walia)**  
**Judge**

22.03.2022  
'Rajneesh'

*Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*