

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CONTEMPT CASE (C) NO. 266 OF 2017

- D.D. Agnihotri, S/o Late Shri Angad Prasad Agnihotri, aged about 65 years, R/o Village- Larkeni, Post Dhober, Tahsil- Marwahi, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Gourishankar Mishra, Secretary, Water Resource Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralay, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Hemraj Kutare, Engineer in Chief, Water Resources Department, Sihawa Bhawan, Civil Line, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Jayant Pawar, Chief Engineer, Mahanadi Godawari Kachhar, District Raipur (C.G.)
4. Akhilesh Verma, Deputy Director, Hydrometeorology Division No.4, near Data Center, Sinhawa Bhawan, Civil Line, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Prakash Tiwari and Mr. Palash Tiwari, Advocates.
For Respondents 3 & 4	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jha, Advocate, along with Respondents 3 and 4 in person.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

09/08/2017

1. By order dated 7.7.2017, this Court had directed the Respondents No. 3 and 4 to remain present before this Court on 9.8.2017 to explain their conduct so far as order of recovery of the amount of gratuity from the Petitioner.
2. Respondents No. 3 and 4 present today before this Court make a submission in the open Court that the order of recovery of gratuity shall not be acted upon and that they shall be issuing a corrigendum in this regard at the earliest.
3. Likewise, Shri Rakesh Kumar Jha, learned Counsel appearing for Respondents No. 3 and 4, also makes a submission on instructions from Respondents No. 3 and 4, that the pension papers already have been processed so far as the Petitioner is concerned and the same have been sent to the District Treasury Office. He further makes a submission that the

arrears of pension shall also be released by the same authorities and that appropriate steps have been taken by the Department and have been sent to the Treasury Office for release of the amount.

4. In view of the aforesaid submissions made by the Respondents No. 3 and 4 in presence of their Counsel, this Court is of the opinion that nothing further remains to be adjudicated upon in the present contempt proceeding, hoping that the grievance of the Petitioner shall be redressed at the earliest which according to the Counsel for Respondents No. 3 and 4 would be completed within an outer limit of two months from today.

5. With the aforesaid observations, since the order passed by this Court in Writ Petition (S) No. 1504 of 2016 is being complied with by the Respondents, nothing further remains to be proceeded further in the present contempt proceeding and the same is accordingly closed and the Respondents are discharged from the contempt proceeding.

6. Needless to mention that in the event if the Respondents fail to comply with the order by releasing the arrear and the arrear of pension within the stipulated time period, the Petitioner will have the liberty to revive the contempt proceeding.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge