

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CONT No. 632 of 2017

Deepak Kumar Rathore S/o Mevaram Rathore, Aged About 32 Years Presently Posted As Assistant Professor (Electronics And Communication Engineering) At Guru Ghasidas Central University, Koni, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. R/o F-53, Bramhaputra Hostel I.I.T. Guwahati, Assam.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. B. N. Tiwari, The Registrar-In-Charge, Guru Ghasi Das Central University, Koni, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Smt. Anjila Gupta, Vice Chancellor, Guru Ghasi Das Central University, Koni, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Mukesh Kumar Singh, The Dean (SoS Engg. And Technology) Guru Ghasi Das Central University, Koni, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Nipun Kumar Mishra, Head Of Department, Electronics And Communications Engg. Guru Ghasi Das Central University, Koni, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr. Neeraj Pradhan, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

18/02/2019

1. The present contempt petition has been filed against the violation of the order dated 19.07.2017, passed in WPS No.3159/2017. The issue decided in the said writ petition was the cancellation of the study leave, which was already granted to the petitioner. This Court while deciding the writ petition had allowed the writ petition and quashed the order.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that subsequent to the order being quashed by this Court, as a consequence, the petitioner ought to have had been formally relieved for pursuing his study leave that he

has already undertaken and he should also get the other dues that he was entitled for during the study leave period.

3. The counsel appearing for the respondents on instructions submits that as per the directions given by this Court, the petitioner has since been relieved for study leave and as such the petitioner's grievance stands fully redressed and so far as the emoluments during the intervening period is concerned, the petitioner has already filed a separate writ petition i.e. the WPS No. 6421/2018.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner has already been officially relieved by the respondent/University, the petitioner should be paid all the benefits as per the Rules for the intervening period.
5. Given the said submissions by the counsel for the respondents, this Court is of the opinion that, the substantial compliance of the order has been done and so far as the benefit that the petitioner is entitled for the same, would be decided in the writ petition that has subsequently been filed by the writ petitioner for the same.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the present contempt petition stands disposed off.
7. The respondents stand discharged of the contempt proceedings.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge