



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

111

COCP-4754-2025

Date of Decision: 17.09.2025

Satinder Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

Vijay Kumar Chopra and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA**

Present: - Mr. Sidharth Sehgal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manmeet Singh Teji, AAG, Punjab.

**NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 19.01.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by this Court in CWP-6275-2015 titled as 'Shingara Singh vs. Chief Engineer PWD (B&R) Punjab Chandigarh and others', whereby it was directed as follows:-

*“Resultantly, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition by imposing cost of `1,00,000/-. In order to enure benefit of the aforementioned order of mine to all other persons who has not approached to this Court. All the persons if approach the Chief Engineer for payment of compensation assessed in view of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, the aforementioned exercise be done as expeditiously as possible within a period of 10 months but since petitioner has been constrained to approach this Court as his valuable right has been taken, compensation by way of cost of `1,00,000/- has been imposed on the respondent(s) to be paid to the petitioner within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.”*

2. Heard.

3. First and foremost a contempt petition cannot lie after 08 years of the passing of order dated 19.01.2017. As per Section 20 of the



Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 ‘No Court shall initiate any proceedings of contempt, either on its own motion or otherwise, after the expiry of a period of one year from the date on which the contempt is alleged to have been committed.’ Thus, a contempt petition cannot be entertained at this belated stage in respect of order dated 19.01.2017.

4. I find support in my view from a recent judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **S. Tirupathi Rao v. M. Lingamaiah (SC) : Law Finder Doc Id # 2618555** wherein it is held that:-

*“Delay in filing a contempt petition should be adequately justified, and the court must adhere to the limitation period stipulated under Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act.*

*A. Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 Section 20 Limitation for actions for contempt - The High Court's judgment allowing a review petition without adhering to the limitation period was erroneous - The contempt petition was barred by limitation as it was filed more than five years after the order, and no sufficient cause for delay was shown - The concept of "continuing wrong" must be adequately pleaded and established to overcome the limitation bar.”*

5. Clearly therefore, the present contempt petition is not maintainable.

6. Thus, keeping in view the above said facts, the present petition stands **Dismissed**.

7. Rule is discharged.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of.

**17.09.2025**

*rishu*

**( NIDHI GUPTA )  
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable Yes/No**