

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. 973 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C) .12257/2015

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 12257/2015 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 10-04-2015

PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER IN THE WP(C):

K. SARATH CHANDRAN
S/O J.KRISHNANKUTTY, T.C.35/1804, THIRUMALA PO
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 006

BY ADV. SRI.S.VISHNU

RESPONDENT(S)/4TH RESPONDENT IN THE WPC:

SHRI. F.SHEHERYAR
DIRECTOR GENERAL, ALL INDIA RADIO, AKASHAVANI BHAVAN
NEW DELHI-110001

R1 BY ADV. SRI.KRISHNADAS P.NAIR, CGC

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

COC 973 OF 2015

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES :

ANNEXURE A1 : TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 10TH APRIL 2015
IN W.P.(C) NO. 12257 OF 2015

ANNEXURE A2 : TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTRATION SLIP TO PROVE THAT
RESPONDENT HAD BEEN SERVED WITH ANNEXURE A1 JUDGMENT.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON J.

~~~~~

Cont. Case (C) No. 973 of 2015

against

W.P.(C) No. 12257 of 2015

~~~~~

Dated, this the 9th day of September, 2015

JUDGMENT

Non-compliance of the direction contained in Annexure A1 judgment made the petitioner to approach this Court by filing this contempt of Court case.

2. The learned Central Government Counsel appearing for the respondent submits that though a notice was issued to the petitioner directing him to appear on 28.08.2015, the petitioner has not chosen to appear.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after passing the judgment by this Court, the respondent simply passed an order, without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner after recording the statement, which is contrary to the direction contained in the judgment. On pointing out this, the respondent sent a notice asking the petitioner to appear on 28.07.2015, but the petitioner could not appear because of paucity of time.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent submits that since the notice could not be served to the petitioner on time, the respondent is ready to fix another date based on the convenience of the petitioner, to be let known. The learned counsel for the respondent further submits that, if the petitioner intimates a convenient date within one week, the matter could be caused to be finalized accordingly.

In the above circumstances, it is for the petitioner to intimate the convenient date to the respondent at the earliest, at any rate, within one week. The respondent shall finalize the matter within one month from the date of hearing to be held.

With the above observations, the contempt matter stands closed.

Sd/-

P. R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
(JUDGE)

kmd