

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 493 of 2017

Mukesh Pratap Singh S/o Shri R. K. Singh Aged About 34 Years R/o B 53 Phase 1, Seepat Road, Vijayapuram Colony Sarkanda Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. D.N.Sirsant Registrar, Chhattisgarh Swami Vivekanand Technical University, Newai, P. O. Newai, District Durg (Chhattisgarh)
2. Aashish Jaiswal, The Director Of The Chouksey Group Of College , Lal Khadan, Masturi Road, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh. 495004
3. Dr. Dheeraj Ahirwar , Principal Shcool Of Pharmacy Chouksey Engineering College, Lal Khadan Masturi Road, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Neeraj Chouby, Advocate
For Respondents No. 2 & 3	:	Shri Anurag Dayal Shrivastava, Advocate

S.B. Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

26/10/2017

Heard.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging willful disobedience of order passed by this Court on 20.9.2016 in WPS No.4917 of 2016.
2. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the only operative reason for sending the petitioner to Patna (Bihar) office vide order dated 21.4.2017 (Annexure C-5) is to overcome and overreach the orders and proceedings of this Court because in the said order in the endnote, it has also been said that presently, the petitioner may be sent as he is not taking any classes. It has been also alleged that in order to overreach the order of the Court, the respondents sent misleading information to the University to strike out name of the petitioner from the roll of teachers in the Institution.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents states before the Court that earlier information regarding petitioner being not in Institution was sent by mistake and a corrective letter has now been sent to the Registrar of the University on 3rd August 2017 for including the name of petitioner and three other teachers of the Institution by submitting that because of typographical mistake, the names were not included. He submits that the petitioner is continuing in the roll of institution, because there is an interim order of the Court.
4. This Court protected the petitioner against termination and it does not restrict the manner in which and the place where the services of the petitioner can be taken. I find that earlier also vide order dated 20.5.2016 (Annexure R-2/10), the petitioner and other teaching staffs were deployed to work in the Patana office. Therefore, it does not appear that for the first time, only to overreach the interim order of the Court, the petitioner is being sent.

Though number of other grounds have been raised by the petitioner to assail legality and validity of order dated 21.4.2017 (Annexure C-5), this may be examined only in a separately constituted petition and not in the contempt petition. Therefore, petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order dated 21.4.2017.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge