

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.1434 OF 2009 (Civil)

Corrected vide
chamber order
dated
16-1-2012

BETWEEN

1. SHARANAPPA NATIKAR
S/O BALLAPPA NATIKAR
AGE: MAJOR
OCC: ASST. TEACHER
GURUPADA SHIVACHARYA
HIGH SCHOOL
GORTA (B) BASAVAKALYAN
TQ: DIST: BIDAR

.. COMPLAINANT

(By Sri. AMRESH S ROJA, ADVOCATE)

AND

1. DR.NAMBUDERI
THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT VIDHANA
SOUDHA, BANGALORE.
2. THE COMMISSIONER FOR
PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS
NEW PUBLIC OFFICES
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BANGALORE

✓

3. M.H.DONNUR
THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS
BIDAR DISTRICT, BIDAR
4. SMT.SHEETAMMA
W/O SUDHAKAR
THE INDIRA GANDHI HIGH SCHOOL
AURAD, TQ:DIST: BIDAR
REP BY ITS PRESIDENT
5. THE SHIVALINGESHWAR
HIGH SCHOOL
HIREJEWARGI TQ: AFZALPUR
DIST: GULBARGA
REP BY ITS PRESIDENT.

(By Sri.M.KUMAR, AGA FOR R1 TO R3)

... RESPONDENTS

... Accused

Corrected
vide chamber
order dated
16-1-2012

CCC FILED U/S 11&12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT
PRAYING TO PUNISH THE ACCUSED IN THE INTEREST OF
JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

ORDER

The complainant's grievance in this complaint is
that, a direction was issued by this court to
accommodate him as a teacher in any of the aided
institutions run by the private management in Bidar
District and in pursuance of the direction, such
appointment orders were issued. When he went to report
to duty in those private educational institutions, he was

not permitted to join[✓] duty and therefore, inspite of said direction, he could not be accommodated in any other private educational institutions. We see from the order, in the first place the writ petition is dismissed, as a concession these directions are issued. In terms of the directions, admittedly, the Government has issued him an appointment order appointing him in private educational institutions, if in those institutions he was not permitted to join, then, it is open to the petitioner to take appropriate action, contempt is not a remedy, as the government has obeyed the orders of this court.

In that view of the matter, we see no merit in this complaint. Accordingly, it is rejected reserving liberty to the petitioner to work out his remedy in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

Cm/-