

Court No. - 9

Case :- CONTEMPT APPLICATION (CIVIL) No. - 6561 of 2023

Applicant :- Ashwani Kumar Rajput

Opposite Party :- Sunil Dutt, District Selection Committee/Basic Shiksha Adhikari

Counsel for Applicant :- Akhilesh Kumar Singh, Gyanendra Kumar Mishra

Counsel for Opposite Party :- Satyaveer Singh

Hon'ble Rohit Ranjan Agarwal, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Satyaveer Singh, learned counsel for the opposite party.

2. The writ Court on 20.09.2022 while disposing of Writ - A No.14512 of 2022 has passed the following order :

"Heard Sri Akhilesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the State-Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and Sri Ashok Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the Respondent No.3.

The petitioner is aggrieved by non-issuance of appointment letter on the post of Assistant Teacher of Arts subject in general category. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in respect of the above, the petitioner has already preferred a representation dated 18.08.2022 before the Respondent No.3, District Selection Committee / Basic Education Officer, District Mathura, but the same is still pending consideration.

He further submits that purpose of filing this writ petition would be served if directions are issued to the Respondent No.3, District Selection Committee / Basic Education Officer, District Mathura, to pass appropriate orders on the pending representation of the petitioner.

Learned Standing Counsel for the State Respondent Nos.1 & 2 as well as learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No.3 submit that they have no objection to the aforesaid proposition.

Considering the submissions advanced, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the writ petition pending and the same is accordingly, disposed of expecting the Respondent No.3, District Selection Committee / Basic Education Officer, District Mathura, seized with the application of the petitioner dated 18.08.2022, to pass appropriate orders thereon, after considering all aspects of the matter, strictly in accordance with law, preferably within a period of two months from the date of service of a certified copy of this order.

Needless to say that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim of the petitioner and it shall be open for the Respondent No.3 to pass appropriate orders."

3. From perusal of the order it is clear that a direction was issued to the opposite party to decide the representation of the applicant.
4. Today when the matter was taken up, counsel for the opposite party has placed before the Court the decision taken by the opposite party on 03.11.2023, which is taken on record.
5. As the order of the writ Court has been complied with and the representation of the applicant has been decided, the contempt application has rendered infructuous and stands **dismissed** leaving it open to the applicant to challenge the order passed by opposite party before the appropriate Forum, if so advised.
6. Contempt notice stands discharged.

Order Date :- 7.11.2023

Kushal