

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**CONTEMPT CASE (C) NO. 922 OF 2019**

Baijoram Mandavi, S/o Shri Heeraman Singh Mandavi, aged about 45 years, R/o Village Bamhani, Charbhata, Post & Tahsil Chhuriya, District Rajnandgaon (CG)

... Petitioner

versus

1. Mr. Rakesh Chaturvedi, Principal Chief Conservatory of Forest, Head Quarter, Jail Road, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Shalini Raina, Present Conservator of Forest, Durg Circle, District Durg, Chhattisgarh.
3. Mr. S.S.D. Badgiya, Conservator of Forest, Durg Circle, District Durg, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Parag Kotecha, Advocate.
For Respondents No.1 & 2	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Advocate.
For Respondent No.3.	:	Mr. Himanshu Sinha, Advocate, under instructions of Mr. Suyash Dhar, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

09/03/2020

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging non-compliance of the order dated 10.12.2018 passed by this Court in WPS No. 8126/2018.
2. It would be relevant at this juncture to take note of the direction given by this Court while disposing of the said writ petition. This Court had in the operative part of the aforesaid order directed the respondents to reconsider the case of the petitioner for regularization and to pass a fresh order.
3. The respondents on notice have entered appearance and filed documents. Pending the contempt petition, the respondents have taken a decision finding the petitioner not fit for regularization and later on passed an order on 14.11.2019 in this regard intimating the same to the petitioner.
4. Given the fact that the direction to the respondents by this Court was for reconsidering the case of the petitioner and to pass a fresh order and the respondents now having passed an order on 14.11.2019 after reconsidering the case of the petitioner, this Court is of the view that the direction given by this Court stands complied with.
5. However, in case, if the petitioner is of the view that the order dated 14.11.2019 is not proper, legal and justified, the only recourse now left for the petitioner is to challenge the same by way of a fresh writ petition. Veracity of the

said order is not one which can be tested exercising the contempt jurisdiction of this Court under the Contempt of Courts Act.

6. Accordingly, reserving the right of the petitioner to challenge the order dated 14.11.2019, the contempt petition is disposed of and the respondents are discharged from the contempt proceedings.

/sharad/

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE