

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CONTEMPT CASE (C) No. 888 of 2019

Tukaram S/o Late Shri Chunnu Ram Sahu @ Chunnu Ram Sahu, Aged
About 42 Years, Forest Range Doundi, Forest Division Durg, District :
Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Shri Jai Singh Mahsake, Secretary, Forest Department, Mantralaya,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Shalini Raina, Chief Conservator of Forest, Chhattisgarh, Raipur,
District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. S.S.D. Badgaiya, Conservator of Forest, Durg, District : Durg,
Chhattisgarh
4. Devend Singh Nagesh, The Divisional Forest Officer, Forest Division
Durg, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh
5. Devend Singh Nagesh, The Forest Range Officer, Forest Range
Doundi, Forest Division Durg, Chhattisgarh
6. M. Govind Rao S/o. M.S. Rao, Retired Forest Divisional Officer, Balod
Division, Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh, At Present R/o.
Dharampura, Radhaswami Satsang Chowk, Pani Tanki, Pan Thela Ke
Pas, Raipur, District: Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Jitendra Gupta, Advocate
For Resp. No. 1	:	Mr. Syed Majid Ali, Advocate
For Resp. No. 2 and 5	:	Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondent No. 6	:	Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge

Order on Board

Per, P. Sam Koshy, Judge

20.02.2020

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging non-compliance of the order passed by this Court on 16.05.2017 in WPS No. 1703/2015.
2. A perusal of the pleadings would show that the respondent authorities have already considered the case of the petitioner and vide their order dated 06.10.2018, after consideration found the petitioner not fit for regularization in terms of circular dated 05.03.2008.
3. In view of the fact that the direction of this Court being to consider the case of the petitioner in terms of the circular and the respondents having considered and decided the same, we are of the opinion that the Order passed by this Court stands duly complied with.
4. Counsel for the petitioner, at this juncture, submits that in the case of other similarly placed persons, the respondents have taken a different view, therefore, the act on the part of the respondents is one which is discriminatory.
5. This ground of the petitioner also is not one which can be considered by this Bench exercising the contempt powers. The ground which the petitioner has raised is one which can only be looked into under the writ jurisdiction, provided that the petitioner challenges the order of the respondents dated 06.10.2018 by way of a fresh writ petition.
6. Reserving the right of the petitioner for availing the said remedy, the present contempt petition in its present form stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. R. Ramachandra Menon)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE