



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

COCP No.1811 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision :04.07.2025

Vipin Kumar as Contractor

.....Petitioner

Versus

Deepak Kumar, Executive Officer, M.C. Kaithal

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate for the respondent.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (Oral):

1. Learned counsel representing the respondent submits that in compliance of the directions dated 12.12.2024, passed in CWP-33446-2024 (Annexure P-1), a speaking order dated 02.05.2025 has been passed, in which it has been held as under:-

“4. During the hearing no documents or any authentic paper has been produced in support his claim by the petitioner. As per records, allotted tender work Valmiki Community Hall was completed on 21.01.2021. The petitioner vipin kumar had already received Rs. 21,40,000/- against said tender on 12.02 2021. Beside this, the petitioner vipin kumar have also been already received security amount 2,14,000/- on 14.08.2022. Now nothing is due or pending regarding tender in question against the Municipal Council, Kaithal.

5. But the petitioner Vipin Kumar had served a legal notice dated 30.09.2024 through his counsel. The same had been replied to the petitioner and his counsel.

6. The petitioner is claiming tender amount of Rs. 25,23,129/- as revised and later increase/revised of Rs.49.95 only on the basis of rough cost estimate noting of purposed work by JE Pankaj, without administrative approval, which is illegal. The tender allotted to the petitioner was neither revised to Rs 25,14,803/- nor was the tender ever revised to Rs 49.95 lakh. Nor has any administrative permission been given. JE Pankaj has no authority to revise the tender. Apart from the tender work, no additional work was added



with administrative permission nor is there any record now available of any additional work done apart from the tender work. Even the petitioner have illegally by misleading the Municipal Council and wrongly obtained Rs 1,61,355.16, which the petitioner should deposit immediately along with 18% interest from the date of receiving till the date of return payment.”

2. That being so, no further orders are required to be passed in the instant contempt petition and the same is accordingly disposed of.
3. Rule is discharged.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

04.07.2025

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No