

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 489 of 2016

- Goverdhan Sharma S/o Late Shri L.D.Sharma, Aged About 48 Years The Corporator Of The Municipal Corporation Raipur, Elected Chairman Of Education Department Of Municipal Corporation, Raipur, R/o Near New Sai Mandir, Sai Chowk Lakhenagar Raipur, P.S. Lakhenagar, Tahsil And District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Vikas Sheel The Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. B.S.Maravi, The Director, School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Rohit Yadav, The Secretary, Urban Administration And Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Rajat Bansal, The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Ashish Tikariha, Upper Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. Gokul Singh Kshatri, Deputy Commissioner, Education Department, Municipal Corporation, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
7. D.K.Banswar, Deputy Commissioner, General Administrative Department, Municipal Corporation, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
8. Ashok Narayan Banjara, District Education Officer, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
9. Upendra Kshatri, Block Education Officer, Sakharam School, Vivekanand Ashram, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh(Contemnors)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. S.C. Verma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

27/10/2016

Heard on admission.

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 29.02.2016 passed by this Court in WPC No. 1004 of 2015.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents in order to over reach the order passed by this Court have proceed to hand over the Institution and take all other steps in view of their policy decision which was under challenge in the writ petition.
3. This Court did not restrain the respondents from giving the effect to their policy decision, but it was observed that the decision taken by the respondents and the implementation thereof shall be subject to final outcome of the writ petition, therefore, in that view of the matter, I am not convinced that there has been violation of the order passed by this Court. The contempt petition is accordingly dismissed.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be granted liberty to mention the matter for urgent hearing.
5. Dismissal of the contempt petition does not come in the way of the petitioner in moving any application for early or urgent hearing.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge