

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 267 of 2021

- Rajkumar Singh S/o Kelwa Aged About 52 Years R/o Village- Birkona, P.O. And P.S. Koni, Tehsil And District- Bilaspur, Now Working As Vehicle Driver, Municipal Corporation, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Pravakar Pandey Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Bilaspur, Vikas Bhawan, Raipur, Road, Nehru Chowk, Below Apex Bank, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. 495001
2. Rakesh Jaiswal Addl. Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Bilaspur, Vikas Bhawan, Raipur Road, Nehru Chowk, Below, Apex Bank, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. 495001

--- Respondents

For the Petitioner : Mr. D.K. Swain, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

16.03.2021

Heard.

1. This Court by its order dated 02.03.2020 passed in WPS No. 1179 of 2020 has directed respondent No. 4 (Commissioner, Municipal Corporation) to decide the representation of the petitioner for regularization according to the circular of the State government.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said decision has been arrived at by Additional Commissioner and communication has been made. He further submits that the Additional Commissioner do not have the power to decide that the petitioner is not entitled for regularization. He would submit that according to the order passed by

this on 02.03.2020 specific direction was given to the Commissioner to decide the case of the regularization consequently contempt has been made out.

3. Perusal of the order of dismissal of the representation of the petitioner dated 15.07.2020 (Annexure C-3) would show that as per the opinion obtained from the higher authority and approved by the Commissioner the regularization of the petitioner has been denied. This Court at this stage will only confine to see that the order has been complied in its true spirit or not. Perusal of orders to refuse regularization would show that the representation of the petitioner has been denied. If the petitioner is aggrieved that the representation has been wrongly decided then he has to seek remedy by filing a better constituted petition. In facts of this case no deliberate disobedience of order has been made out.
4. With the above observations/direction, this contempt petition stands disposed of.

**Sd/-
GOUTAM BHADURI
JUDGE**

Jyoti