

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

TUESDAY, THE 28TH DAY OF JULY 2015/6TH SRAVANA, 1937

Con.Case(C).No. 956 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).30933/2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 30933/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 24-11-2014.

PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN THE WPC :

P AMBILI, AGED 54 YEARS,
(W/O. LATE P.N.RAMACHANDRA DAS, A/E, RETIRED)
ASHA BHAVAN, THAZHATHUVADAKKU P.O., ENATHU VIA,
PATTAZHY, KOLLAM DISTRICT-691 526.

BY ADV. SRI.N.SASIDHARAN UNNITHAN

RESPONDENT/2ND RESPONDENT IN THE WPC :

C BABU,
(AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER),
CHIEF ENGINEER(HRM), KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
VAIDHYUTHA BHAVANAM,
PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 024.

R BY SRI.K.S.ANIL, SC, KSEB

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 28-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

: 2 :

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE I : CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE HON'BLE
HIGH COURT DATED 24.11.2014 IN W.P.(C) NO.
30933/2014.

ANNEXURE II : TRUE COPY OF LETTER DATED 12.12.2014 OF THE
COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER.

ANNEXURE III : TRUE COPY OF THE POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT CARD.

RESPONDENTS' ANNEXURES: NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Contempt Case (C) No. 956 of 2015
in
W.P. (C) No. 30933 of 2014

Dated this the 28th day of July, 2015.

JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent, apart from perusing the record.

2. This Court on 24.11.2014, disposed of W.P.(C) No. 30933 of 2014 through Annexure I judgment. Without entering into the arena of merits, this Court has directed the respondent Board to dispose of the petitioner's Ext.P5 representation concerning the disbursement of terminal benefits of the petitioner's husband. Complaining of non-compliance with Annexure I judgment, the petitioner has filed the present Contempt case.

3. Today, across the Bar, the learned counsel for the respondent has submitted an order dated 22.07.2015, which is said to have been passed in compliance with Annexure I judgment.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has strenuously contended that the quantification of amount said to have been due from the deceased employee, ie., the petitioner's husband, has been done without any notice. He has further contended that various

other terminal benefits have not at all been adverted to in the order dated 22.07.2015.

5. On a perusal of the order dated 22.07.2015, which has just been handed over by the learned counsel for the respondent, I am of the opinion that there is sufficient compliance with the direction of this Court in Annexure I judgment. Indeed, the petitioner may still have her grievances concerning the benefits she is entitled to or the liabilities her deceased husband had been fastened with.

6. To the credit of the learned counsel for the petitioner, he has submitted that an opportunity may be granted to the petitioner to impugn the order dated 22.07.2015. It goes without saying that even in the absence of any opportunity being granted by this Court, the petitioner has ample statutory support to lay challenge against the order dated 22.07.2015, if he chooses to.

Observing thus, this Court closes the Contempt Case as having not survived for consideration.

sd/- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE.

