

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CONT No. 290 of 2016**

- Smt. Savitri Mandavi W/o Shri Jageshwar Singh Mandavi, Aged About 63 Years R/o Village- Charama, Distt.- North Bastar, Kanker, Ex. Supervisor, Dept. Of Women & Child Development, Block- Charama, Distt. North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Sonmani Bora , Secretary, Dept. Of Women And Child Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Smt. M.Geeta Secretary, Dept. Of Women And Child Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh(Contemnors)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner
For Respondents

Mr. Pawan Shrivastava, Advocate
Mr. Anup Majumdar, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra
Order On Board

15/11/2017

1. Respondent/Contemner No.2 Smt. M. Geeta is present in person.
2. Heard.
3. In the previous order dated 4.10.2017, it was observed that contemner No.2 was aware of the order passed by this Court on 10.08.2016 itself, yet the appeal was decided on 22.6.2017, therefore, allegation of inordinate and willful delay is *prima facie* appealing. This Court thereafter summoned respondent

No.2 to appear in person.

4. Today, Smt. M.Geeta, Contemner No.2, would appear and explain the nature of proceedings and circumstances, due to which, the order could be passed on 09.05.2017.
5. It appears, even without any observation by this Court that the petitioner be heard in person while deciding her appeal, the respondent/contemner No.2 provided opportunity of hearing to the petitioner not only once but twice. Some delay is also attributed, as usual, to the movement of file from the respondent's Department to the Law Department.
6. Considering the entirety of the circumstances and the note sheets filed along with the return, it appears, the delay is not malafide only with an intention to not to comply with the order passed by this Court within time. However, at the same time, the respondents should expedite the matter whenever this Court has directed some proceeding to be completed within a particular time period.
7. The contempt having already been purged and the delay not being malafide or deliberate, the contempt proceeding needs to be dropped.
8. Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

Judge

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)