

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**CONT No. 955 of 2019**

Yogendra Ojha S/o Late Shri N.N. Ojha Aged About 58 Years R/o M I G - 1,
2886, Housing Board, Bhilai, Police Station - Jamul, Tahsil And District -
Durg Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Durgesh Madhav Awasthi Director General Of Police (D. G. P.) Chairman,
State Police Establishment Board, Police Headquarter (P. H. Q.) Police
Station And Post Office - Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District - Raipur
Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Ashok Juneja, Additional Director General Of Police (A - D. G. P.), Member,
State Police Establishment Board, Police Headquarter (P. H. Q.) Police
Station And Post Office - Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District - Raipur
Chhattisgarh
3. O. P. Pal, Deputy Inspector General Of Police (D. I. G. P.) , Member, State
Police Establishment Board, Police Headquarter (P. H. Q.) Police Station
And Post Office, Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. R. N. Das, Superintendent Of Police (S. P.) Member, State Police
Establishment Board, Police Headquarter (P. H. Q.) Police Station And
Post Office - Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Prakhar Pandey, Superintendent Of Police (S. P.), Office Of Superintendent
Of Police, Durg, District - Durg Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Abhishek Pandey with Ms. Deepika Sannat, Advocates
For State	:	Mr. V. R. Tiwari, Addl AG
For Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****03/02/2020**

1. The matter today is taken up on a Court slip given by this Court.
2. On 07.01.2020, this Court had ordered for issuance of baillable
warrants to the respondents.

3. Today when the matter is taken up, the counsel for the respondents submit that order/directions given by this Court in WPS 6013/2019 dated 14.08.2019 was already complied with as early as on 19.11.2019. However, due to inadvertence the said reply could not be promptly brought on record and for some personal reasons, counsel engaged by the respondents in the present contempt petition also could not appear on 07.01.2020 which led to this Court for issuance of bailable warrants. The petitioner has also moved appropriate application for recalling of the bailable warrants issued against the respondents. Along with the reply the respondents also have enclosed an order dated 19.11.2019 passed by respondent No.1 (Annexure R/1-3). In the said order the authorities have specifically dealt with the representation which the petitioner had raised and also the directions given by this Court and have finally rejected the representation of the petitioner. Since direction was only for passing the order on the representation made by the petitioner and respondents having passed an order on 19.11.2019, this Court is of the opinion that the order passed by this Court stands duly complied with.
4. If at all, if petitioner is aggrieved of the order dated 19.11.2019, the recourse available to the petitioner now would be to challenge the same afresh in a fresh proceeding. The veracity of the said order cannot be tested under the contempt jurisdiction by this Court. The earlier order dated 07.01.2020 of issuance of bailable warrants to the respondents also stands recalled, the contempt petition stands disposed of and the respondents are discharged from the contempt proceedings.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge