

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CONT No. 1015 of 2019

Deepak Kumar Verma S/o Late Narayan Prasad Verma Aged About 27 Years R/o Village And Post Janji, Police Station Seepat, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. D.M. Awasthi, Director General Of Police, Police Head Quarter, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Pradeep Gupta Inspector General Of Police, Bilaspur Zone Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. Prashant Agrawal Superintendent Of Police, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri C.J.K. Rao, Adv.
For Respondents	: Shri Mateen Siddiqui, Adv.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

14.01.2020

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging non compliance of the order dated 24.07.2019 passed in WPS No. 5151/2019.
2. Counsel for the respondents has entered appearance and has filed a detailed reply on 23.10.2019, along with reply, he has filed Annexure R/1 dated 24.09.2019. Vide the said order, respondents have rejected the claim of the petitioner.
3. Counsel for the Petitioner, however, submits that respondents have not considered the claim of the petitioner in the proper perspective and the authorities have given a wrong interpretation to the order passed by this High Court particularly the Judgment rendered in the case of **Sohan Lal Patel V. State of Chhattisgarh and Ors** passed

in WPS No. 4383/2016 decided on 06.10.2017. This Court while disposing of the writ petition had specifically ordered that the respondents to take a decision so far as claim for compassionate appointment is concerned, it was also directed that while taking a decision, they shall keep in mind the judgment of this High Court in the case of Sohan Lal Patel.

4. The impugned order Annexure R/1 dated 24.09.2019 shows that the case of Sohan Lal Patel has been dealt with by the respondents and have finally held that the petitioner is not entitled for the claim made by.
5. Given the facts that the counsel for the respondents have already decided the claim of the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the order has since been complied with.
6. If at all, if the petitioner is aggrieved of the subsequent decision, the **petitioner** would be required to challenge the same and get the said order quashed by way of a specific writ to be issued for grant of compassionate appointment, reserving the right of the petitioner for availing the same, the contempt petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge