

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.ABDUL REHIM**

**THURSDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF AUGUST 2015/29TH SRAVANA, 1937**

**Con.Case(C).No. 687 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).12318/2010**

**-----  
AGAINST JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 12318/2010 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA  
DATED 20-12-2014**

**PETITIONERS/PETITIONERS:**

**-----**

- 1. JOSEPH ANTONY,  
AGED 54 YEARS, S/O.JOSEPH,  
RESIDING AT CHARANKATTU HOUSE, THEKKUMMURI  
ARTHUNKAL PO, CHERTHALA SOUTH VILLAGE,  
CHERTHALA TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**
- 2. JALAJA JOY,  
AGED 46 YEARS, W/O.JOSEPH ANTONY,  
RESIDING AT CHARANKATTU HOUSE  
THEKKUMMURI, ARTHUNKAL PO, CHERTHALA SOUTH VILLAGE  
CHERTHALA TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**
- 3. ANTONY PRAVEEN,  
AGED 26 YEARS, S/O.JOSEPH ANTONY,  
RESIDING AT CHARANKATTU HOUSE  
THEKKUMMURI, ARTHUNKAL PO, CHERTHALA SOUTH VILLAGE  
CHERTHALA TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**

**BY ADV. SRI.K.N.RAMACHANDRA PANICKER**

**RESPONDENT/APPOINTED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT:**

**-----**

**SMT. D. JAYASREE,  
AGE & FATHER'S NAME AND ADDRESS NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER  
WORKING AS DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER (RECOVERY)  
GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL OFFICER,  
ATTACHED TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT BANK AND APPOINTED BY THE  
GENERAL MANAGER, DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE BANK, ALAPPUZHA  
VIDE LETTER NO.ADCB/27221/2014-2015 DATED 2-3-2015  
HEAD OFFICE AT ALAPPUZHA.**

**BY ADV. SMT.K.N.RAJANI, SC, ALAPPUZHA DIST.CO.OP.BANK LTD.**

**THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 20-08-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

**AMG**

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS**

- ANNEXURE-A- TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 20-12-2014 IN WPC No.12318/2015 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- ANNEXURE-B- TRUE COPY OF THE POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT CARD ON RECEIPT OF JUDGMENT ON 26-02-2015 BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- ANNEXURE-C- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER No.ADCB/27221/2014-15 DATED 02-03-2015 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT APPOINTING THE DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER (RECOVERY) AS THE GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL OFFICER.
- ANNEXURE-D- TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER No.NIL DATED 17-03-2015 ISSUED BY D. JAYASREE, THE GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL OFFICER TO THE PETITIONER.
- ANNEXURE-E- TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.ADCB/REC NO.6948/2915-16 DATED 11-07-2015 ISSUED BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, ADC BANK, ALAPPUZHA TO SRI. JOSEPH ANTONY, THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- ANNEXURE-F- TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER No.6949/ADCB/REC DATED 11-07-2015 ISSUED TO SMT. JALAJA JOY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- ANNEXURE-G- TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER No.ADCB/REC No.6950 DATED 11-07-2015 ISSUED TO THE 3RD PETITIONER, SRI.PRAVEEN ANTONY.

**RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS**

NIL

True copy

P.A. To Judge

AMG

**C.K. ABDUL REHIM, J.**

-----  
**Con. Case (c) No. 687 OF 2015**  
-----

DATED THIS THE 20<sup>th</sup> DAY OF AUGUST, 2015.

**J U D G M E N T**

The direction in Annexure-A judgment was to the 'Grievance Redressal Officer' to re-consider claims of the petitioners and to take appropriate decisions with respect to their eligibility for getting the benefit under Ext.P11 scheme, after conducting appropriate enquiry into the relevant records of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent Bank, with opportunity afforded to the petitioners. This contempt of court case was filed on the allegation that 'Grievance Redressal Officer' has not taken any decision as directed by this court.

2. Initially when the case was taken up, the respondent had filed counter affidavit contending that, eligibility of the petitioners were examined and except in the case of the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner, all the claims were rejected finding that other petitioners are not eligible for benefits under the scheme. But the petitioners had filed reply

affidavit producing Annexure-A to Annexure-C communications which would indicate that no proceedings was issued on adjudication of the issues regarding eligibility of the petitioners as directed in the judgment. When the matter was taken up for further consideration on 30-07-2015 learned counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that direction was already given to issue appropriate proceedings to the petitioners and on that basis the case was further adjourned

3. Today when the case is taken up, learned counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that reports regarding the enquiry conducted, showing details of the verifications of the records and containing findings regarding eligibility of the petitioners with respect to benefit of the scheme, has already been communicated to the petitioners.

4. In view of the above mentioned circumstances this court is of the opinion that no further steps in this contempt of court case need be pursued. It is made clear

that the petitioners will be at liberty to challenge the decision if any taken with respect to their eligibility for getting benefit of the scheme, if they are aggrieved, in appropriate proceedings before appropriate forum.

Sd/-  
**C.K. ABDUL REHIM**  
**JUDGE**

AMG

True copy

P.A. to Judge