

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Contempt Case (C)NO.181 of 2018**

1. Prahlad Kashyap (P.Kashyap) S/o Shri Chetan Kashyap Aged About 45 Years R/o Village Dagania, P.S. Seepat, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Civil And Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Smt. Jona Singh W/o Shri B. Singh Aged About 50 Years R/o At Present Rajkishore Nagar, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Smt. Manorama Tamboli W/o Shri Satish Shrivastava (Tamboli) Aged About 40 Years R/o Near Bus Stand Ratanpur, Dabhrapara, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Smt. Padmawati W/o Shri Dayaram Sharma Aged About 47 Years R/o Near Panchmukhi Hanuman Mandir, Mangla, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
5. Smt. Radha Verma W/o Shri Shambhu Verma Aged About 41 Years R/o Near Main Post Office, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
6. Surendra Shrivastava S/o Shri Anirudh Shrivastava Aged About 42 Years R/o At Present Mangla Near Talab, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
7. Smt. Anita Batra W/o Shri Tilak Ram Batra Aged About 61 Years R/o At Present Neharu Nagar, Pareejat Colony, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
8. Kushal Gourha S/o Shri Rishiram Gaurha Aged About 45 Years R/o At Present Near Sakari Bazar, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
9. Sanjay Tiwari S/o Shri Bhagwati Tiwari Aged About 40 Years R/o Deendayal Colony, Lig-70, Mangla, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

Shri Girish Chandra Varma Managing Trustee, Maharishi Ved Vigyan Vidyapeetham, Registered Trust Having Its Registered Office At A-14, Mohan Industrial Estate, Mathura Road, New Delhi (Now Changed To 121, First Floor, DLF Galleria, Mayur Vihar, Phase-1, New Delhi) Administrative Officer At Village Chhan, Bhojpur Marg, Near Water Park, Post Gisrod, Tahsil Hujur, Bhopal District Bhopal (M.P.).

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioners	:	Shri MK Sinha, Advocate.
For Respondent	:	Shri Animesh Verma, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****25/04/2018**

1. The present contempt petition has been filed against the alleged non compliance of the order dated 19.10.2016 passed in WPL No. 206/2016. This Court on an earlier occasion had issued notice to the respondent and also directed that in case of non compliance, they would remain present before this Court.
2. Today, Shri Animesh Verma, advocate enters appearance on behalf of the respondent along with 9 cheques payable to the 9 petitioners herein and states that the letters which were being sent to the petitioners have come back with a note of either they were not available at their address or their addresses were not traceable. He submits that he has brought those cheques before this Court so that the same can be given to the counsel for the petitioners who in turn may hand over the same to the respective petitioners.
3. At this juncture, counsel for the petitioners submits that he does not have any objection in accepting or receiving the same.
4. Accordingly, the 9 cheques were handed over to the counsel for the petitioners before the Court itself and receipt in this regard was given by the counsel for the petitioners to the counsel for the respondents.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in an earlier contempt petition i.e. Contempt Case (C)No.566 of 2017, 40 cheques were handed over by the respondent to the petitioners of which one cheque bearing No.888682 of the State Bank of India issued in favour of one Vijay Swarnakar for an amount of Rs.55,500/- has been dishonoured on account of not matching

specimen signature. Accordingly, a fresh cheque amounting to Rs.55,500/- issued in favour of Vijay Swarnakar is handed over to the counsel for the petitioners before the Court itself, who in turn handed over dishonoured cheque to the counsel for the respondent.

6. Be that as it may, since the respondent have honoured the order passed by this Court and issued cheques in favour of the respective 9 petitioners for making payments towards the compliance of Section 17B of the Industrial Disputes Act, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the contempt petition pending any further. The contempt petition thus stands disposed of and the respondent stands discharged from the contempt proceeding. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to bring it to the notice of the respondent if there is any calculation error or any shortfall of payment made by the respondent.
7. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge