

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CONT No. 910 of 2020**

- Pramod Mishra S/o Lt. Shri Suresh Kumar Mishra (Constable No. 395) Aged About 39 Years R/o Near New Talab, In Front Of Singhal Kirana Store, Gudhiyari, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Shri Umesh Agrawal Home Secretary, Dept. Of Home, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, P.S. And Post- Rakhi, Distt.- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Shri D. M. Awasthi The Director General Of Police, Police Head Quarter, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Shri R. K. Bridge Inspector General Of Police/ Additional Director General, Railway Headquarter, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Shri Himanshu Gupta Inspector General/ Additional Director General, Administration, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Shri J. R. Thakur Superintendent Of Police, Railway, The S.P. Office, Station Road, Raipur, Dist.- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Y.C. Sharma, Advocate along with Mr. Sachin Nidhi, Advocate.
For Respondent No.5	:	Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****26/11/2020**

Heard.

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 24.11.2017. By the said order passed in WPS/7039/2016, this Court had directed the authorities/respondents to examine petitioner's claim for grant of compassionate appointment. After initial stages of collection of document from the petitioner, various information and personal hearing, when no decision was taken, the petitioner has filed this contempt petition. Finally, a reply has been filed in this case, wherein, it has been disclosed that the petitioner's representation has been considered and rejected on certain grounds vide order dated 25.11.2020 by Superintendent of Police, Railways, Raipur, though belatedly.

2. Though learned counsel for the applicant sought to submit that the grounds, on which, application has been rejected, are not sustainable in law, that aspect cannot go into a contempt petition. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the order, it is open for the petitioner to challenge the order separately in the appropriate forum by taking appropriate remedy available under the law.
3. With the said liberty, the contempt petition is disposed off.
4. Before parting with the case, this Court cannot resist from observing that the authorities virtually slept over the orders of the Court. It is rather unfortunate and tells upon bad governance when the authorities took almost three years to comply with the order passed by this Court which only required short inquiry to be made. The order was complied with only at the cost of filing contempt petition. It is noteworthy that this Court had issued direction. Despite that, the Authorities did not think it proper to decide the matter. The authorities of the respondents have to be reminded that they are public officials and their utmost duty is to comply with the orders of the Court of Law.
5. Though initially, this Court was inclined to proceed against concerned erring officials, at present, the case is closed with the warning that if this conduct is repeated in future, this Court will take strict view and appropriate proceedings will be drawn.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge