

GAHC010149432022



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

Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/419/2022

BITOPAN BARMA AND 4 ORS.

S/O- SADANANDA BARMA

R/O- MUSALMAN GAON,

P.O- CHENGA, P.S- TARABARI, DIST- BARPETA, ASSAM, PIN-781305

2: AMZED HUSSAIN

S/O- ABDUL LATIB

R/O- BARBALA

P.O- BARBALA

P.S- HOWLY

DIST- BARPETA

ASSAM

PIN-781316

3: TOIMUL HUSSAIN

S/O- MOKTUB ALI

R/O- TENGA GAON

P.O- AMGURI

P.S- SARBHOG

DIST- BARPETA

ASSAM

PIN-781317

4: SHAHIDUL ISLAM

S/O- SAMIR UDDIN AHMED

R/O- GANDHARI PARA

P.O- MECHPARA

P.S- BARPETA ROAD

DIST- BARPETA
ASSAM
PIN-781313

5: RAFIKUL ISLAM
S/O- NAZIM UDDIN
R/O-KUTHURIJHAR

P.O- KALAPANI BAZAR
P.S- GOBARDHANA
DIST- BAKSA
ASSAM
PIN-78131

VERSUS

RAKESH KUMAR
MANAGING DIRECTOR, ASSAM POWER, DISTRIBUTION COMPANY
LIMITED (APDCL), BIJULEE BHAWAN, PALTAN BAZAR, GUWAHATI,
ASSAM, PIN-781001

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. M K HUSSAIN

Advocate for the Respondent : MR. P N GOSWAMI

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MEDHI**

ORDER

01.05.2024

Heard Shri M. Alom, learned counsel for the petitioners, who by means of this petition has complained regarding non-compliance of the order dated 17.01.2022 passed by this Court in WP(C)/2602/2020. It is submitted that by the aforesaid order, a direction was given to the APDCL to consider the cases of the individual petitioners of their claim for regularization by following the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Umadevi and Ors.*** reported in ***(2006) 4 SCC 1.***

2. Shri B. Choudhury, learned counsel appearing for the APDCL has however submitted that the directions have been complied with and after consideration of the cases of the petitioners and other similarly situated persons, the office order dated 02.12.2023 has been passed. On a perusal of the copy of the said office order which has been presented before this Court, it appears that there has been a consideration of enhancement of the monthly remuneration of various categories of the employees.
3. In view of the aforesaid development, this Court is of the view that the order of this Court appears to be substantially complied with.
4. Accordingly, the contempt petition is closed.
5. A copy of the office order dated 02.12.2023 is made a part of the records.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant