

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

WEDNESDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/18TH BHADRA, 1937

Con.Case(C).No. 380 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).26775/2013

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 26775/2013 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED
01.11.2013

PETITIONER/PETITIONER/PETITIONER:

USHA JACOB, AGED 60 YEARS
W/O. LATE C.JACOB, HOUSE NO. 29/30 A, S.A.ROAD
COCHIN-19.

BY ADV. SRI.P.GEORGE VARGHESE

RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT:

NALINI NETTO
W/O. NETTO, PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HOME (C) DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT-695001.

R BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. R. PADMARAJ

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 09-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

CONT. CASE © NO. 380 OF 2015

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES :

ANNEXURE A1 : TRUE COPY OF THE SAID JUDGMENT DATED 01.11.2013
IN W.P.(c) NO. 26775/2013

ANNEXURE A2 : A TRUE OFFICE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 01.11.2014
SENT BY THE PETITIONER THROUGH COUNSEL TO THE
RESPONDENT UNDER REGISTERED POST WITH A/D

ANNEXURE A3 : TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT CARD
SIGNED BY the RESPONDENT FOR HAVING RECEIVED ANN. A2

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON J.

~~~~~

Cont. Case (C) No. 380 of 2015

against

W.P.(C) No. 26775 of 2013

~~~~~

Dated, this the 9th day of September, 2015

JUDGMENT

The learned Government Pleader submits that the direction given by this Court as per Annexure A1 judgment has been complied with by the respondent, passing appropriate orders on Ext. P8 representation.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the rent payable has been decreased and same stands detrimental to the rights and interests of the petitioner.

3. Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court finds that the direction given by this Court as per Annexure A1 to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext. P8 has been complied with by the respondent and as such, there is no contumacious act on the part of the said respondent.

In the said circumstances, the contempt matter stands closed, without prejudice to the rights and interest of the petitioner to

Cont. Case (C) No. 380 of 2015
against *W.P.(C) No. 26775 of 2013*
: 2 :

challenge the order stated as passed, if it stands detrimental to the rights and interest of the petitioner.

Sd/-

**P. R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
(JUDGE)**

kmd