

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 494 of 2015

1. Govind Singh Uddey S/o Late Ramu Singh, Aged About 41 Years Posted As
Supervisor On C. H. C. Dhamdha District Durg (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. R. Prasanna Director Health Services, Directorate Health Services, Govt. Of
Chhattisgarh Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Dr. Prashant Shrivastava, Chief Medical & Health Officer, District Durg
(Chhattisgarh).....(Contemnors)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner.

: Shri B. P. Singh, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

06/11/2015

Heard.

1. This contempt petition has been preferred by the petitioner alleging willful disobedience of Court's Order by respondent/Director as well as by the Chief Medical Officer Durg.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the order was passed by this Court on 14.09.2015 the same was sent by post to respondent No.1 Smt. R. Sangeeta , thereafter the Chief Medical Health Officer also informed the Block Medical Officer vide order dated 19.10.2015 that order passed by this Court has been forwarded to the Director vide memo dated 19.10.2015. However, in the meantime, the petitioner is not being allowed to work at Dhamda. Till date even the decision on representation has not

been communicated in compliance of order dated 14.09.2015 passed in earlier round of proceedings in contempt case No. 372/2015.

3. While disposing of petitioner's writ petition, no interim order was granted. However order dated 14.09.2015 in contempt case no. 372/2015 is clear. The authority is under obligation to decide it within 3 weeks from the date of receipt of the order. The petitioner has submitted that copy of order dated 14.09.2015 was sent by post the date of receipt of order dated 14.09.2015 is not on record. Memo of Chief Medical and Health Officer shows that copy of order of this Court was forwarded by him to the Director vide memo dated 19.10.2015.

4. Taking into consideration the period which has elapsed by now, in the absence of there being on record, the date of receipt of copy of Order dated 14.09.2015 I am not inclined to issue notice. The respondent however, are under obligation to communicate to the petitioner as to whether his representation has been decided as per order dated 14.09.2015. If the petitioner is not communicated the same by any of the respondent within a period of 3 weeks from today, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the contempt petition.

Sd/-

Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Judge

amita