IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK AGARWAL ON THE 27th OF MARCH, 2023

WRIT PETITION No. 15219 of 2021

BETWEEN:-

SOURABH SHARMA S/O LATE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR SHARMA, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, PATHAK WARD DISTT. KATNI (MADHYA PRADESH)

....PETITIONER

(NONE)

AND

- 1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THR. SECRETARY PUBLIC HEALTH ENGINEERING DEPTT. VALLABH BHAWAN BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)
- 2. CHIEF ENGINEER PUBLIC HEALTH ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT JABALPUR REGION DAMOH NAKA (MADHYA PRADESH)
- 3. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER PUBLIC HEALTH ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT DIVISION KATNI (MADHYA PRADESH)

....RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI SOURABH SONI - PANEL LAWYER FOR THE STATE)

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

ORDER

Lawyers are abstaining from work.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner and respondent No.5 this is direct violation of the order(s) passed by Hon'ble the Division Bench of this Court on 24.3.2023 in Writ Petition No.7295/2023 (In

Reference (Suo Motu) Vs. Chairman, State Bar Council of Madhya Pradesh and Others) wherein following directions have been issued to the Members of the Bar Association:-

- (i) All the advocates throughout the State of Madhya Pradesh are hereby directed to attend to their court work forthwith. They shall represent their clients in the respective cases before the respective courts forthwith;
- (ii) If any lawyer deliberately avoids to attend the court, it shall be presumed that there is disobedience of this order and he will be faced with serious consequences including initiation of proceedings for contempt of court under the Contempt of Courts Act;
- (iii) If any lawyer prevents any other lawyer from attending the court work, the same would be considered as disobedience of these directions and he will be faced with serious consequences including initiation of proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act;
- (iv) Each of the judicial officers are directed to submit a report as to which lawyer has deliberately abstained from attending the court;
- (v) The judicial officers shall also mention the names of advocates who have prevented other advocates from entering the court premises or from conducting their cases in the Court;
- (vi) Such advocates shall be dealt with seriously which may even include proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act as well as being debarred from practice.

As nobody is appearing for the petitioner as well as for respondent No.5,

issue notice by both the modes i.e. ordinary as well as by registered A.D. mode against Shri Manoj Chandurker, learned counsel for the petitioner to show cause as to why the contempt proceedings be not initiated against him for deliberate and willful non-compliance of the order(s) of Hon'ble the Division Bench of this Court dated 24.3.2023 passed in Writ Petition No.7295/2023 (In Reference (Suo Motu) versus Chairman, State Bar Council of Madhya Pradesh and Others) Steps be taken within seven working days.

None for the petitioner.

Petitioner is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 17.02.2021 passed by the Executive Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department Project, Division Katni, rejecting an application for grant of compassionate appointment to the petitioner on the ground that petitioner's father was working as a daily wager and there is no provision for grant of compassionate appointment to the daily wager in terms of the Clause 11.1 of the Policy in this behalf dated 29.09.2014.

Respondents' counsel submits that petitioner's father died on 22.12.2020. Annexure P-1 is the death certificate. At that time, Policy dated 29.09.2014 was invoked. Thus, as per Clause 11.1, petitioner is only entitled to ex-gratia of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lacs Only).

Let the same be paid within a period of six weeks, if not already paid as petitioner is not entitled to grant of compassionate appointment in terms of the said policy, petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

(VIVEK AGARWAL) JUDGE

