

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

FRIDAY, THE 25TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/3RD ASWINA, 1937

Con.Case(C).No. 58 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).25226/2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 25226/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 27-10-2014

PETITIONER/PETITIONER : -

C.P.ARAMNDAKSHAN, AGED 58 YEARS,
S/O. K.SANKARAN NAIR, MANAGER,
UCO BANK (PFM NO.32041), HOUSE NO.11,
RAJEEV NAGAR COLONY, PALLIKUNNU P.O.,
KANNUR-670 004.

BY ADVS.DR.K.P.SATHEESAN (SR.)
SRI.M.R.JAYAPRASAD
SRI.P.MOHANDAS (ERNAKULAM)
SRI.ANOOP.V.NAIR
SRI.S.VIBHEESHANAN
SRI.N.MANU THAMPI

RESPONDENT/FIRST RESPONDENT: -

ARUN KAUL, AGED 50 YEARS,
(FATHER'S NAME OF NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER),
CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, UCO BANK,
HEAD OFFICE, 10 BTM, SARANI, KOLKOTTA-700001.

R1 BY ADV.SRI.GEORGE KARITHANAM VARGHESE, SC. UCO BANK
R1 BY ADV.SRI.C.I.ABRAHAM
R1 BY ADV.SRI.JOSE KURIAKOSE (VILANGATTIL)

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY
HEARD ON 25-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES :

ANNEXURE I : CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 27.10.2014
IN W.P. (C) No. 25226/2014.

ANNEXURE II : COPY OF THE LETTER SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO
THE ZONAL MANAGER DATED 6.12.2014.

RESPONDENT'S ANNEXURE : NIL.

// TRUE COPY //

P.A. TO JUDGE

DMR/-

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Cont. Case (C) No. 58 of 2015

Dated this the 25th day of September, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner initially approached this Court complaining that the respondent Bank has not agreed to retire him on a voluntary basis. Essentially going by the counter affidavit filed by the respondent Bank, this Court has felt that there was no issue to be adjudicated upon, for the respondent Bank fairly conceded that it would expedite the process of the petitioner's retirement on voluntary basis once he appeared before the Bank.

2. Now, the petitioner has come up with the contempt case alleging that Annexure I judgment of this Court has not been complied with.

3. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondent Bank has submitted that the respondent Bank has already complied with the direction of this Court and retired the petitioner on voluntary basis.

4. Nevertheless, the learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that there are many disparities in settling the

terminal benefits of the petitioner. In that regard, the learned counsel has drawn my attention to Annexure II representation said to have been submitted by the petitioner before the respondent Bank.

5. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the petitioner was retired from service by the respondent Bank, as has been directed in Annexure I judgment. Thus, there is full compliance with the direction of this Court. At any rate, if the petitioner has any grievance concerning the alleged disparity in the settlement of his terminal benefits; it gives, in my view, a fresh cause of action to the petition to agitate further.

With the above observations, the contempt case stands closed.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU
JUDGE

DMR/-