

GAHC010157812025



undefined

**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**  
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**

**Case No. : Cont.Cas(C)/379/2025**

AINAL HOQUE  
S/O LATE HASEM ALI, R/O VILL- BHUTPUKHURI, P.O.- NO. 1 PUNIA, DIST-  
DARRANG, ASSAM

VERSUS

SMTI. SURANJANA SENAPATI, ACS  
THE DIRECTOR OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, ASSAM, KAHILIPARA,  
GUWAHATI-19

**Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. H ALI, MS A DAS,B BARMAN**

**Advocate for the Respondent : ,**

**BEFORE**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NELSON SAILO**

**ORDER**

**Date : 23.02.2026**

Heard Mr. H. Ali, learned counsel for the petitioner, who submits that this contempt petition is filed for non-compliance of the Court's direction dated 28.06.2024 passed in WP(C)/3321/2024. Paragraph-9 of the said order is a direction given by the Court to the Director of Elementary Education to place the

case of the petitioner for consideration of provincialisation of his services before the State Level Scrutiny Committee in terms of the order dated 29.05.2023 issued by the Secretary to the Govt. of Assam, Department of School Education.

**[2.]** Mr. S.M.T.Chistie, learned counsel for the respondents on the other hand has produced a letter written by the Director of Elementary Education, Govt. of Assam to the Secretary to the Govt. of Assam, Department of School Education by which it has been stated that the SLSC in its meeting held on 26.07.2023 has decided to forward the proposal for provincialisation of services of the petitioner to the State Government. Accordingly, a proposal for creation of one post of Tutor against Bhutpukhuri Janajagaran MEM under the District of Darrang was proposed. The learned counsel therefore submits that direction of this Court vide order dated 28.06.2024 has been duly complied with by the respondent.

**[3.]** The learned counsel for the petitioner however submits that the petitioner is not aware about such a proposal and even if such a proposal was made, the same has not materialise till date and therefore the order of this Court remains not complied with till date. It is however seen that the order of this Court was for placing the case of the petitioner before the State Level Scrutiny Committee and the Communication dated 28.09.2023 produced by Mr. S. M. T. Chistie, learned counsel goes to show that the case of the petitioner was placed before the SLSC in the meeting held on 26.07.2023 and the SLSC has decided to recommend his case for provincialisation to the State Government. This Court therefore finds that insofar as the purpose of the instant contempt petition is concerned, the limited issue involved has already been addressed by the respondent concerned. Accordingly, contempt petition stands closed. As for the grievance made by the petitioner, despite his name having been sent to the Government, it would be up to the petitioner to take the matter forward as may

be permissible in law, if so advised.

**[4.]** The Communication dated 11.11.2023 and 28.09.2023 produced by Mr. S. M. T. Chistie, learned counsel are being retained in the record and marked as 'x' for identification.

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**