



disposed of on 23.10.2008. It appears from the Annexure-3 series that in between the said period on 16.11.2009, the Court had again issued direction that if petitioner is aggrieved by non-compliance of the orders, he will be at liberty to file individual contempt application. The said order was passed in C.W.J.C. No. 8140 of 2007. The representation thereafter was filed on 16.10.2012 (Annexure-3 series). The orders passed in C.W.J.C. 8140 of 2007 was again sought to be placed before this Court in MJC No. 269 of 2013.

Meanwhile, the petitioner had also sought implementation of an order passed in C.W.J.C. No. 14436 of 2005 which was disposed of on 23.07.2007. The MJC which arose out of the same was numbered as 2435 of 2007. It appears from the said order that this Court, after considering the grievance, observed that if the petitioner is aggrieved by any order passed on 23<sup>rd</sup> of January, 2008 (Annexure-F), which is also Annexure – R- 6/B, the petitioner would have a remedy to challenge the said order in accordance with law before an appropriate Bench.

In view of the fact that both the orders are identical, this Court does not find any further need to proceed in the contempt application. The contempt



application stands disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to raise all the grievances before the appropriate forum, if so advised.

**(Anjana Mishra, J)**

Jagdish/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

