

(Arising out of order dt. 08/05/2013 passed in W.P. 7383/2013)

PETITIONER:

Hivarkhed Shivram Siksha Samiti Through its president Ramesh Gwhade S/O Late Shri Shivram Gawhade, aged about 38 yrs R/O F-22-C/81 Saket Nagar Bhopal Distt-Bhopal M.P.

RESPONDENTS :

VERSUS

Smt. R. Jaya chairman/member secretary National Council for the Teachers Education head office Hans Bhawan wing -II Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.

ov B. Fuery

Shri Sunil Shrivastava regional director, National Council for the Teachers Education WRC (Western Regional Committee) Manas Bhawan, Shyamla Hills, Bhopal Distt.- Bhopal

CONTEMPS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA READ WITH SECTION 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT.

- That, the petitioner is filing present contempt petition for non-compliance of the order dt. 08/05/2013 passed in W.P. 7383/2013. A-copy order dt. 08/05/2013 passed in W.P. 7383/2013 is filed as <u>Annexure C/1</u>.
- 2. That, by aforesaid order ANNX.C/1 Hon'ble court has directed to respondent /contemnors to decide case of the petitioner for grant of recognition for the D.El.Ed. Course in the light of decision in W.P. 9988/2012[Captain Ramesh Chand Nema Vs National Council for the Teachers Education].
- 3. That, the petitioner submitted application along with the order of this Hon'ble court and requested for extension of





HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESP

ORDER SHEET

SE No.....

Vs...

DATE OF THE ORDER

ORDER

Conc. No.703/2014

18/7/2014.

Shri Brindawan Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Shri K. K. Singh, learned counsel for the respondents.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on a perusal of the reply filed by the respondents it is clear that now the only grievance of the petitioner is that recognition and approval for the session 2014-2015 has not been granted.

In the writ petition the only direction was to consider the application of the petitioner in case a fresh application is filed. It is said that the petitioner was prevented from filing the application because the petitioner was not given access to approach the website of the Council to submit the online application.

However, the respondents refutes the aforesaid. There being a dispute between the parties with regard to the petitioner being submitted application in accordance to rules, it is not appropriate to initiate action for contempt. In case the petitioner is aggrieved by the manner in which he was denied permission to submit his application for the academic session 2014-2015 it gives a fresh cause to the petitioner to agitate the matter in accordance with law but it is not

