

submits that this was only in respect of 2015-16, whereas, in the petition and in the order of this Court, reference has been made to petitioner's appeal dated 10-09-2017, which is, in fact, for the years 2013 to 2016 and no such order has been passed in respect of 2013-14. To this Counsel for the respondents / alleged contemnors has referred to the compliance report and submits that the issue for 2013 and 2014 had already been decided much prior to the filing of this petition, hence, no further orders were required to be passed as the petitioner was well aware about these evaluations of 2013 and 2014.

4. In view of such position, since the matter for years 2013 & 2014 already stood decided much prior to filing of this petition, whereas, against such orders, no finding on merits was given by the Court; nor at the time of passing of the consent order in question, any such grievance was ever raised; rather, placing reliance on letter dated 10.9.2017 an order was sought from the Court, which in fact amounts to misleading the Court as the case for the years 2013-2014 had already been decided. Therefore, in that case the Respondents were not required to once again decide the grievance of the petitioner in respect of these years as well.

5. In view of the above, we do not see as to how a case for contempt is made out, and therefore, in the earlier part of the day by means of a short order, we had **dismissed** the application and these are the reasons thereof.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit