

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**CONTEMPT CASE (C) NO. 261 OF 2019**

• Vinod Chandra Gupta, aged about 64 years, S/o Late Girish Chandra Gupta, Retd. Revenue Inspector, Municipal Council, Baikunthpur, R/o Ward No.16, Opposite Palace, Baikunthpur, District Koriya (CG) ... **Petitioner**

versus

1. Airmel Mangai Di, Director, Department of Urban Administration & Development, Directorate, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur.
2. Vasudeo Chauhan, Joint Director, Department of Urban Administration & Development, Surguja Division, Ambikapur, District Surguja (CG)... **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Pawan Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Respondent 2	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

11/12/2019

1. The present contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated 8.8.2018 passed by this Court in WPS No. 5042/2018.
2. This Court while disposing of the said writ petition had directed the respondents to process the representation of the petitioner to the extent whether the petitioner would be entitled for the benefit of time bound pay scale and whether the petitioner would be entitled for salary in the pay scale of Rs.4500-7000/- instead of Rs.4000-6000/-.
3. The respondents were noticed. They have entered appearance and have filed their reply and also two additional reply. Though in piecemeal, vide order dated 3.8.2019, an order has been passed by the respondents in favour of the petitioner holding the petitioner to be entitled for the benefits with effect from 1.1.2006.
4. According to the petitioner, the representation that he had made was for grant of the said benefit from the date he became eligible, that is in the year 2000. This submission of the petitioner would not be one which would be adjudicated upon exercising contempt jurisdiction of this Court. The direction to the respondents was to consider and decide. Though not within stipulated period, but the respondents at a later stage have now decided the same in favour of the petitioner.

5. The dispute now is only in respect to, from what date the petitioner was actually entitled for the said benefits. Though the respondents have now accepted their liability for payment of the said benefits from January, 2006 onwards, the remaining part of the claim of the petitioner that is in respect of his claim for the benefits from the year 2000 onwards, is one which would have to be raised by the petitioner by either approaching the respondents by way of a representation or by way of filing a fresh writ petition for adjudication on that count.

6. So far as the non-compliance of the order dated 8.8.2018 passed by this Court in WPS No. 5042/2018 is concerned, the order dated 3.8.2019 now passed by the respondents shows that the same has been complied with.

7. The contempt petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

/sharad/