

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/29TH PHALGUNA, 1936

Con.Case(C).No. 329 of 2015 (S)

JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 27444/2014 DATED 21-10-2014

PETITIONER:

SMT.SONIA GEORGE, AGED 38 YEARS
HIGH SCHOOL ASSISTANT(MALAYALAM)
ASSUMPTION HIGH SCHOOL SULTHAN BATHERI P.O PIN 673 592

BY ADVS.SRI.S.K.BALACHANDRAN
SRI.V.K.NANDAKUMARAN

RESPONDENTS:

DR.VISHWAS MEHTHA
S/O.(NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER) AGE (NOT KNOWN TO THE
PETITIONER) SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF KERALA
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPT., GOVT SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM PIN 695 001

R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. K.I.SANJEETHA

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 20-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE A1: CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 21.10.2014 IN WP(C)
NO.27444/2014.

ANNEXURE A2: LETTER DATED 31.10.2014.

ANNEXURE A3: POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT CARD.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS: NIL

TRUE COPY

PA TO JUDGE

Scl.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Cont. Case (C) No.329 of 2015

Dated this the 20th day of March, 2015.

JUDGMENT

On 21st October 2014, this Court disposed of W.P.(C) No.27444 of 2014 with the following direction:

“In the facts and circumstances, having regard to the respective submissions of the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader, this Court, without adverting to the merits of the matter, disposes of the writ petition with a direction to the 1st respondent to consider Ext.P5 communication sent by the 3rd respondent in the light of Ext.P6 representation submitted by the petitioner, after affording an opportunity of being heard in person to the petitioner, and pass appropriate orders thereon, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. Once the clarification is received from the Government, the 3rd respondent shall consider Ext.P4 representation of the petitioner in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders thereon within one month from the date of receipt of clarification from the 1st respondent. No order as to costs.”

2. Complaining of non-compliance with the direction in Annexure A1 judgment dated 21.10.2014, the petitioner has

filed the present contempt of court case.

3. Today, the learned counsel for the petitioner has reported that the direction in the judgment has been complied with, in so far as the first respondent is concerned. He has further submitted that concerning the compliance on the part of the second respondent, there is still time.

In the facts and circumstances, having regard to the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court closes the contempt of court case as having not survived for further consideration.

**Sd/-
DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU
JUDGE**

Scl.