

GAHC040007392019



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)
(ITANAGAR BENCH)

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/51/2019

MS. HABUNG YAMI AND 2 ORS.

Age: 33

Occupation :

Address:D/O LT. HABUNG DIBO

R/O VILLAGE RERU

P.O/P.S- ZIRO

DISTT LOWER SUBANSIRI

A.P

PRESENT RESDENT OF D-SECTOR

ANAHARLAGUN

P.O/P.S- NAHARLAGUN

DISTT PAPUM PARE

2: MISS. LAXMI JAMOH

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address:D/O- SHRI. TAMANG JAMOH

R/O VILLAGE MIRSAM

P.O/P.S PASIGHAT

DISTT EAST SIANG

A.P

3: MISS. NUNG BOKO

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address:D/O- T. BOKO

R/O HOUSE NO.3 MAHALAXMI STREET

GANAPATHYPURAM

EAST TAMBARAM CHENNAI.

VERSUS

MR. P. RINGU

Age: 0
Occupation :
Address:DIRECTOR
NORTH EASTERN INSTITUTE OF FOLK MEDICINE
PASIGHAT
ARUNACHAL PRADESH

Advocate for : M Loder
Advocate for : Tamo Taggu appearing for MR. P. RINGU: Advocate appearing for
respectively.

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR

ORDER

Date : 09-12-2024

Heard Mr. D. Laji, learned counsel for the petitioner.

The present contempt petition has been instituted by the petitioners herein alleging violation of the directive passed by this Court vide order dated 04.10.2019 in WP(C) No. 352(AP)/2019. The direction which has been alleged to have been violated by the respondent, vide the said order dated 04.10.2019, passed by this Court being revelant is extracted herein below;

“...Having considered the matter in the attending facts and circumstances of the case, till the returnable date; the impugned decision of the Director, NEIFM, Government of India, Ministry of AYUSH, Pasighat, dated 01.10.2019, for conducting the interview on 15.10.2019 in the office of the Director of the All India Institute of Ayurveda, Mathura Road, Gautam Puri, Sarita Vihar, Delhi-110076, for the posts of Herbarium Curator/Museum Curator, Ethnobotanist, and Pharmacognosist, for which

separate call letters, stated to have been issued to the petitioners herein viz. Ms. Habung Yami, Ms. Loxmi Jamoh and Ms. Nung Boko, shall remain stayed....”

It is alleged in the present contempt petition that after passing of the said order dated 04.10.2019, the respondents had scheduled the interview for the post of Botanist, which was also advertised vide the same advertisement dated 02.06.2017, by which the post of Ethnobotanist, Pharmacognosist, Herbarium Curator/Museum Curator etc were also advertised. A perusal of the directions passed by this Court and extracted herein above would go to show that this Court had restrained the respondent authorities only from proceeding to conduct interviews with respect to the post of Herbarium Curator/Museum Curator, Ethnobotanist, and Pharmacognosist. There was no restrain order passed by this Court with regard to the post of Botanist, accordingly, this Court is of considered view that respondent authorities in holding the selection for the post of Botanist and scheduling the interview for it on 15.10.2019 had not violated the directions passed by this Court the vide order dated 04.10.2019. Accordingly, no violation of the direction passed by this Court vide the said order dated 04.10.2019 is revealed, consequently, the contempt petition would not be maintainable.

In view of the above, the contempt petition stands closed. The notices issued upon the respondent stands discharged.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant