

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**CONT No. 472 of 2015**

1. Bhushan Lal Kashyap S/o Shri Kapilnath Kashyap, Aged About 60 Years R/o Village Kachanda, Tahsil Nawagarh, Civil & Revenue District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh).....(Applicant)

---- Petitioner

**Versus**

1. Aashish Tikariha Sub Divisional Officer (R), Janjgir, Civil & Revenue District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh).....(Contemnor)

---- Respondent

---

For Petitioner.

: Shri Jeet Patel, Advocate.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**

**Order On Board**

**16/10/2015**

Heard.

1. Alleging willful disobedience of order dated 18.02.2014 passed in W. P.(c) No.5722/2006 & Contempt Case (C) No.246/2014 dated 13.05.2015, the petitioner is before this court in this contempt petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite orders passed from time to time, the Sub Divisional Officer is not supplying the information.

3. The writ petition filed by the petitioner was disposed off vide order dated 18.2.2014. This Order shows that taking into consideration pendency of case before the State Information Commission, petition was disposed off, directing the Commission to take appropriate decision on petitioner's appeal/representation. Letter dated 16.4.2014 Annexure (C-4) shows that Commission required the petitioner to submit necessary documents so that final order could be passed in compliance of order dated 18.2.2014 passed by this Court. Thereafter, what

happened, is not pleaded. There is no document on record to show that any direction was issued by the Commission directing supply of any information.

4. There is a letter dated 29.05.2014 (Annexure C-5) placed on record which shows that the Sub Divisional Officer on the understanding that there is a direction by this Court to supply information, asked the petitioner to collect information from the Office.

5. The petitioner had filed a contempt petition, which was disposed off on 13.05.2015 in that case also the Court had recorded the statement and granted opportunity to the petitioner to approach the SDO Revenue. In fact, there is no order by this Court to supply information to the petitioner. It is also not known what happened to the proceedings pending in the State Information Commission. Thus, the petition is misconceived in law as well as on the facts, therefore, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

**Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**

Judge