

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CONT No. 341 of 2017**

1. Kaushal Kumar Kurre S/o Shri Sawan Kumar Kurre Aged About 32 Years Shiksha Karmi Grade-iii (Librarian) Govt. Higher Secondary School Khongsara, Block- Kota, R/o Village- Lormi, District- Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
2. Smt. Poonam Naz Khakha W/o Shri Rojmin Rajesh Khakha Aged About 34 Years Shiksha Karmi Grade-iii, (Librarian) Govt. Higher Secondary School (Boys), Belgahna, Block- Kota, R/o Mig-40, Nehru Nagar, Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Ku. Divya Bhagat D/o Shri Shobhnath Ram Bhagat Aged About 27 Years Shiksha Karmi Grade-iii (Librarian) Govt. Higher Secondary School, Salka Nawagaon, Block- Kota, R/o Village- Bangaon, Post- Farsabahal, District- Jashpur, Chhattisgarh
4. Smt. Shraddha Sharma W/o Shri Rajesh Sharma Aged About 33 Years Shiksha Karmi Grade-iii, (Librarian) Govt. Higher Secondary School, Chapora, Block- Kota, R/o Prashant Pharmacy, Near Sharda Coffee House, Mangla Chowk Mungeli Raod, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
5. Smt. Pratibha Pandey W/o Shri Vikash Kumar Pandey Aged About 34 Years Shiksha Karmi Grade-iii (Librarian) Govt. Higher Secondary School, Kargi- Kala Block- Kota, R/o Kanchan Vihar, Sipat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. Fareeha Alam Siddiqui Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, New Composite Building Collectorate, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. C.P. Mishra, Secretary Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Shri Ajay Kumrani, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****17/07/2017**

(1) This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner herein alleging non-compliance of this Court's order dated 30.11.2016 passed in W.P. (S) No.1983/2016.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner's representation has been decided by the respondent authorities on 30.03.2017, but his representation was not considered in accordance with law.

(3) Since the petitioner's representation has already been considered and decided finally on merit by the respondent authorities, it would not be expedient to entertain the instant contempt petition.

(4) Consequently, the contempt petition is dismissed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to question order dated 30.03.2017 in accordance with law, if so advised.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-