
(2020) 09 MP CK 0113
In the Madhya Pradesh High Court
Case No : CONC. 1394 Of 2020

Surendra Yadav

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Madhya Pradesh And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-09-2020

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 215
Contempt Of Courts Act, 1971 — Section 12

Citation : (2020) 09 MP CK 0113

Hon'ble Judges : Ajay Kumar Mittal, CJ;Vijay Kumar Shukla, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Yash Soni

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

The present contempt petition has been filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, alleging disobedience of the order dated 10-01-2020 passed by this Court in WP-10687-2019.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had filed the WP-10687-2019 against allotment of Shivaji playground, Cant, Sadar, Jabalpur for non-sports activities by the Cantonment Board, Jabalpur. He has also relied upon the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in Krishan Lal Gera vs. State of Haryana and others [Civil Appeal No.4924/2011].

This Court referring to the judgment passed in Krishna Lal Gera (supra) disposed of the writ petition with the direction to the respondents-authorities not to allot the Shivaji Playground for any activity which is not related to sports. In other words, the said playground shall be used and be permitted to be used only for sports activities. It is alleged that the respondents are raising certain constructions on the pavilion of the playground, which is non-sports activity.

We have perused the order passed by this Court and find that the direction was

not to allot the Shivaji Playground for any activity which is not related to sports. Further, it was held that the said playground shall be used and be permitted to be used only for sports activities.

No material is placed before us that the said playground is being allotted for non-sports activities. In the order passed in the writ petition, there was no restriction for construction of a pavilion in the playground or any stadium.

In view of the aforesaid, no case is made out for contempt against the respondents. The contempt petition is accordingly dismissed.