



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

107

COCP-1879-2026

Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

Simranjeet Singh @ Simranjit SinghPetitioner

Versus

Sh. Manjit Singh Brar and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Petitioner-Simranjeet Singh @ Simranjit Singh
is present in person.

Mr. MS Teji, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Soni and Mr. Tara Dutt, Advocates
for respondents No. 3 to 5.

Mr. Manmeet Singh Teji, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. AnuChatrath, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ratik Chatrath Kapur, Advocate
for respondents No. 6 to 9.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging violation of order dated 15.10.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Hon'ble Ist Division Bench of this Court in CWP-PIL-110-2019 and other connected petitions.

2. At the very outset, it is submitted by learned Senior Counsel for respondents No. 6 to 9 that *prima facie* the present petition is not maintainable as earlier also, the petitioner who is present in person had filed similar petition bearing COCP-3794-2025 alleging violation of



the same order dated 15.10.2024, which was disposed of by this Court

vide order dated 13.01.2026 (Annexure P-5) which reads as under:-

“Present contempt petition has been filed alleging violation of order dated 15.10.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP-PIL-110-2019 titled as”Simranjit Singh vs. State of Punjab and another”, whereby it was observed as under :-

“...This Court is not coming to any conclusion as regards the culpability or mis-conduct on the part of Municipal Corporation officers and employees but leaves it to all the Commissioners of Municipal Corporation in State of Punjab to undertake an inquiry as expeditiously as possible and find out as to who were the erring officers and employees, who had permitted the violation of building sanction during their tenure and conclude the same as within a period of two months and file compliance report latest by 31.01.2025”.

As well as the interim order dated 25.4.2024 (Annexure P-3) whereby time has been extended for completion of enquiry proceedings and time has been extended for completion of enquiry proceedings and submission of compliance report by 30.6.2025. submission of compliance report by 30.6.2025.

It is pointed out by learned counsel for respondents that as has been stated in para 6 of the present contempt petition itself, the Municipal Corporation has taken action against the erring employees Municipal Corporation has taken action against the erring employees and officers and 18 show cause notices and three charge-sheets have been issued to various employees at the level of Municipal Town Planner, Assistant Town Planner, Senior Town Planner and Building Inspector of the Municipal Corporations and enquiries in this regard Inspector of the Municipal Corporations and enquiries in this regard are underway and further time is sought to conclude the enquiry proceedings. This fact has been recorded in the order dated 25.4.2025 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CM passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CM-83-CWPIL-2025 in CWP-PIL-110-2019. It is submitted that accordingly there is no violation of the orders dated 15.10.2024 (Annexure P-1) and order dated 25.4.2024 (Annexure P dated 25.4.2024 (Annexure P-3).

Heard.

Order sheets shows that none has put in appearance on behalf of petitioner since the inception of the present contempt petition. Even today none has put in appearance on behalf of petitioner.



*In view of the facts as acknowledged in the present contempt petition itself and as pointed out by learned counsel for the respondents, the present contempt petition stands respondents, the present contempt petition stands **disposed of**.*

Rule stands discharged.

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

3. The petitioner who is present in person admits factum of filing the similar contempt petition, as aforesaid.

4. Heard.

5. In view of the facts noted above, the present contempt petition is **dismissed**, being not maintainable.

6. Rule stands discharged.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

23.04.2026

rishu

**(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No