

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CONT No. 39 of 2020

1. Fulgence Toppo, S/o Shri Julius, Aged About 59 Years, Posted As Sub Registrar, In The Office of The Sub Registrar Abhanpur Raipur District Raipur, R/o House No. 313, Near Sarshwati Gyan Mandir, Ward No.16 Tulsipur, District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

1. Mr. Jagat Singh Armo, Aged About 61 Years Senior District Registrar Raipur, Office of The District Registrar Raipur, In Front of C.G. Nirwahan Bhawan, Near Ghadi Chouk Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh, Pin 492001
2. Mr. Digvijay Singh Churendra, Aged About 36 Years, Sub Registrar, Office of The Sub Registrar Abhanpur Raipur, Raipur, Tahsil Campus District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

----- Respondents

For Applicant	:	Mr. Vijay K. Deshmukh, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr. Ashutosh Mishra, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order on Board

30.01.2020

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging non-compliance of the order dated 04.10.2019 passed by this Court in WPS No. 8335 of 2019.
2. During the course of hearing, the counsel for the petitioner submits that though the authorities were directed to decide the representation within 45 days but they took almost three months in deciding the same. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents have committed contempt by permitting the person transferred in place of the petitioner

to assume his duties as early as on 26.11.2019; whereas there is a specific stay operating in favour of the petitioner. According to the counsel for the petitioner, subsequently the representation of the petitioner stood decided on 21.01.2020 and the petitioner was thereafter relieved on 22.01.2020. This according to the counsel for the petitioner again shows the malafide on the part of the respondents.

3. On a query being put to the counsel for the petitioner, he fairly concedes that till 22.01.2020, the petitioner has been permitted to work at the same place, though the other person was also permitted to assume his duties. It is further submitted that till the representation of the petitioner was decided, he has not been relieved from the said place.
4. Given the said facts of the case, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner for issuance of notice of contempt to the respondents.
5. Accordingly, the present contempt petition stands rejected.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge**