

सेवा सम्बंधित प्रकरण

1
IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE
BEFORE
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA
ON THE 7th OF SEPTEMBER, 2022
CONTEMPT PETITION CIVIL No. 919 of 2022

BETWEEN:-

PRATAP Singh S/O AMARSINGH, AGED ABOUT
57 YEARS, OCCUPATION: SERVICE 66, CHOUBIS
KHAMBA MARG UJJAIN (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....PETITIONER

(PETITIONER-PRATAP Singh PRESENT IN PERSON)

AND

1. SHRI ANSHUL GUPTA AYUKT NAGAR PALIKA
NIGAM (MADHYA PRADESH)
2. SHRI MANOJ PATHAK APAR AYUKT
(ESTAPHNA) NAGAR PALIK NIGAM UJJAIN
(MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI SOUMITRA BAJAJ-ADVOCATE)

*This petition coming on for orders this day, the court passed the
following:*

ORDER

The present contempt petition is filed alleging non-compliance of the order dated 8.4.2015 passed by this Court in writ petition No. 2474/2011 whereby the respondents were directed to consider the case of the respondent Nos.3 to 6 (including the present applicant) for regularisation on the post on which they were working as daily wager within a period of 30 days. It was further directed that respondents shall hold a DPC for considering the case of petitioners for promotion for the post of Revenue Inspector/Deputy Revenue Inspector as per recruitment governing the field within a period of 3 months.

It is submitted that in compliance to the direction issued by this Court, the case of the present applicant who was respondent in the petition has been considered for regularisation and keeping in view the educational qualification and experience of the applicant, he was regularised on the post of Assistant Revenue Officer and his seniority was fixed from 13.8.2010. Copy of the order dated 19.5.2015 has been filed as Annx.R/1. In compliance of other part of the order dated 3.11.2015, a DPC was constituted for the post of Revenue Inspector. The committee in its meeting dated 5.11.2015 considered the names of the employees based on their work and experience as prescribed in Rule 10(1) of Schedule 4(2) of M.P. Municipal Corporation (Employment and Service conditions of Officers and Employees), ce Rules 2000. The name of the persons who had completed atleast 5 years on the post of Assistant Revenue Inspector were considered for the post of Revenue Inspector. The DPC recommended the names of 4 persons for promotion to the post of Revenue Officer. Copy of the proceedings of DPC and the promotion orders have been filed along with the reply. The present applicant who was respondent in the original writ petition is regularised on the post of Revenue Inspector has already been quashed by this Court. According to the respondents, applicant was working as Time Keeper and considering his qualification and experience he has been regularised on the post of Assistant Revenue officer and has been assigned the seniority on the said post. It is submitted by the respondents that he cannot claim any right for being considered for the post of Revenue Inspector. The persons who were eligible for promotion to the post of Revenue Inspector have been considered and promoted. The order passed by this Court has been complied with.

In view of aforesaid submission, I find that order passed by this Court

has been complied with and no case for contempt is made out.

Contempt petition is accordingly disposed of.

(VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA)
JUDGE

MK

