

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CONT No. 192 of 2016**

- Digvijay Kumar Patel S/o Shri Ramkumar Patel, Aged About 27 Years
R/o Village Bedparsada Post Tikari, P. S. & Tahsil Bilaspur, Civil &
Revenue District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh) ---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. Shri S. S. Bajaj Director, Technical Education Directorate Mahanadi
Bhawan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Dr. Shri K. C. Mahajan, Principal Chouksey Engineering College,
Bilaspur, Lal Khadan Masturi Road Bilaspur, P. S. Torva, Civil &
Revenue District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Shri S. M. Tiwari Registrar, Chouksey Engineering College, Bilaspur, Lal
Khadan Masturi Road Bilaspur, P. S. Torva, Civil & Revenue District
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh).....(Contemnors) ---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Smt. Madhunisha Singh, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri Basant Kaiwartya appears on behalf of Shri V.R.Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondent No.2 & 3	:	Shri Anurag Dayal Shrivastava, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****23/08/2016**

The present contempt petition arises out of order passed by this Court on 17.12.2015 in WPC No.2266 of 2015. By the said order, this Court has followed its earlier order rendered in the case of **Dr. (Major) Thakur Ajit Singh and**

others v. State of Chhattisgarh and others passed in WPC No.7222/2009 affirmed in WA No.42/2011 wherein the students whose parents are Green Card holders have been exempted from payment of tuition fees as per Government Circular dated 30.11.1989.

2. Admittedly, the petitioner is a student in Chouksey Engineering College, Bilaspur, a private engineering college. The college has decided the petitioner's representation and refused to extend the benefit of exemption from payment of tuition fees on the strength of law laid down by the Supreme Court in the matter of ***Principal, Madhav Institute of Technology & Science v. Rajendra Singh Yadav and others, (2000) 6 SCC 608.***

3. In view of above, since the petitioner's representation has already been considered and rejected by the College, no ground for proceeding further in the matter is made out. Accordingly, the rule issued against the respondents is discharged.

4. The contempt petition stands disposed of. However, liberty is reserved in favour of the petitioner to assail the order passed by the College by moving a fresh writ petition, if he so desires.

Sd/-
Judge
(**Prashant Kumar Mishra**)