IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA CIRCUIT BENCH AT GULBARGA

DATED THIS THE 24th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2010

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUBHASH B.ADI

CCC NO.214 OF 2008 (CTVIL)

corrected vide chambel oxdel dt 16/1/2012

BETWEEN

1. SRI RAMU S/O SOMULU AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS GROUP - D EMPLOYEE O/O RANGE FOREST OFFICER TERRITORIAL RANGE, CHITAPUR TALUK CHITAPUR, DIST GULBARGA.

.. COMPLAINANT

(By Sri.GOURISH S.KHASHAMPUR, ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. SRI SUDHAKAR, IAS, THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY VIDHANA SOUDHA BANGALORE - 560001.
- 2. SRI JAIRAJ, IAS,
 THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
 BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
 RURAL DEVELOPMENT
 AND PANCHAYAT
 RAJ DEPARTMENT,

M.S. BUILDING BANGALORE - 560001.

... ACCUSED

(By Sri.M.KUMAR, AGA)

CCC FILED U/S 11 & 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMP PROCEEDING AGAINST THE RESPONDENTS FOR DISOBEYING ORDER DTD.20.08.2001 IN WP.NOs.17587-17726/2001.

This CCC, coming on for orders, this day, $N.KUMAR\ J.$, made the following:

ORDER

This contempt petition is filed complaining that, the directions issued by the court has not been complied with and therefore the complainant seeks for appropriate action for disobedience of the lawful order passed by this court. The direction issued by the court in so far as the complainant is concerned, is as under:

"On consideration, we find that regularization depends upon the availability of substantive posts and the case of individuals can be considered as per their seniority and eligibility as per the schemes and it is also to be seen whether the applications are made after the cut off date 1.7.1984 or before. In our view, these are questions of fact which

cannot be gone into by this court at this stage. Under the circumstances, it will be appropriate that the Government should consider the representation of the respective respondents as per law."

- 2. On consideration, we find that, regularization depends upon the availability of substantive posts and the case of individuals can be considered as per their seniority and eligibility as per the schemes and it is also to be seen, whether the applications are made before the cut off date i.e., 1.7.1984. All these cannot be looked into by this court. No doubt, these are the questions of facts which cannot be gone into by this court, at this stage. Under the circumstances, it would be appropriate that, the Government should consider the representation of the respective respondents as per law.
- 3. The State has filed an affidavit along with the endorsement issued to the petitioner on 25.10.2008. A perusal of the endorsement shows that, the case of the complainant is considered and they have refused to

regularize the services on the ground that, he did not fulfil the conditions prescribed under the scheme which are also set out in the said endorsement. Therefore, when once the direction issued by the court is considered, no contempt could be alleged against them.

4. The learned counsel for the complainant submits that, persons who are similarly placed as that of the complainant are appointed. Though they were also appointed subsequent to the cut off date of 1.4.1984, the complainant has been discriminated. He has been working for the last 25 years uninterruptedly and therefore, he submits, the consideration made is illegal. If the grievance of the complainant is that, he is discriminated and the consideration is not in accordance with law, it is open to him to challenge the said endorsement and seek appropriate remedies which are available to him. That is not the question to be gone into in contempt proceedings. Once the order is complied with, his case is considered and rejected, there is no contempt.

5. In that view of the matter, we pass the following:

<u>ORDER</u>

The contempt proceedings are dropped. Liberty is reserved to the complainant to work out his remedy in accordance with law.

Sd/-JUDGE Sd/-JUDGE

Cm/-