

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No.904 of 2018

1. Ramu S/o Shri Sukhram Aged About 24 Years R/o Village Karampur,
P. O. Kumda Colliery Tehsil Surajpur, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh
2. Sukhram S/o Pardesiya Aged About 66 Years R/o Village Karampur,
P. O. Kumda Colliery Tehsil Surajpur, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.,
---- **Petitioners**

Versus

1. Ghanshyam Singh Posted As Chief General Manager (Bishrampur
Area) Office, Post And P. S. Bishrampur, Tehsil Surajpur, District
Surajpur, Chhattisgarh
2. G. Shyamala Rao Posted As Regional Personnel Manager
(Bishrampur Area), Post And P. S. Bishrampur, Tehsil Surajpur,
District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh
....**Respondents**

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Rishi Sahu, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

23.08.2019

Heard.

1. The contempt petition is brought on the allegation that despite a time bound direction given by this Court on 10.10.2017, in the matter of consideration of petitioners' claim of compassionate appointment in view of acquisition of his land, the application is not being decided.
2. Upon perusal of the reply on affidavit filed by respondent No.1, I find that after the order passed by this Court, the petitioners were given notices on various occasions, commencing from 28.03.2018, after examination of petitioners' case, requiring petitioners to give certain information and supply documents. Despite repeated reminders when relevant information was not

provided, the petitioners' case has finally been closed vide order dated 25.09.2018 though keeping it open for the petitioners to approach the authority with necessary documents and information in support of their claim for appointment.

3. In the opinion of this Court, the respondent authority was not required to do more than what has already been done by him. It appears that the authority could not take any decision on merits of the petitioners' case for want of certain personal information which the petitioner has failed to supply. Even though, the matter has still been kept open.

4. Therefore, I do not find that it is a case of willful disobedience of order of the Court. The contempt petition has no merit and is therefore dismissed.

5. However, it is observed that as and when the petitioners approach the authority with necessary information and documents as demanded in communication dated 28.03.2018, 02.05.2018, 18.05.2018, 28.08.2018 & 25.09.2018, the respondent authority shall take decision on the merits of petitioners' case.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge