

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.RAVIKUMAR

WEDNESDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/25TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

Con.Case(C).No. 1470 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).2946/2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 2946/2014 DATED 3.2.2014

PETITIONER(S)/1ST PETITIONER:

SALIM M.A, AGED 52 YEARS
S/O.ABDUL KARIM, MUNDETTU HOUSE, AYARKUNNAM.P.O
AYARKUNNAM KARA, KOTTAYAM TALUK.

BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE SEBASTIAN

RESPONDENT(S)/3RD RESPONDENT:

KURIAKOSE
AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER
PRESENTLY WORKING AS SECRETARY
KOTTAYAM MUNICIPALITY, KOTTAYAM, PIN-686001.

BY SRI.S.RANJIT (KOTTAYAM), SC, KOTTAYAM MUNICIPALITY

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 16-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

C.O.(C).1470/2015

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

ANNEXURE A:A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 3.2.2014 IN W.P.(C).
2946/2014.

ANNEXURE B:-A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 25.8.2014
SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENT.

ANNEXURE C:A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 7.9.2015
SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENT.

ANNEXURE D:A TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 26.10.2015 ISSUED
BY THE HEALTH SUPERVISOR OF KOTTAYAM MUNICIPALITY.

ANNEXURE E:A TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 2.11.2015 GIVEN BY THE
PETITIONER.

ANNEXURE F:A TRUE COPY OF THE REPL DATED 23.11.2015 ISSUED BY THE
PETITIONER.

ANNEXURE G:A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED NIL SUBMITTED BY
RAJU VARGHESE.

ANNEXURE H:A TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 11.3.2014 ISSUED FROM
KOTTAYAM MUNICIPALITY.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE

C.T. RAVIKUMAR, J.

=====

C.O.(C) No.1470 OF 2015

=====

Dated this the 16th day of December, 2015

JUDGMENT

This contempt case has been filed alleging wilful disobedience with the directions of this Court in judgment dated 3.2.2014 in W.P. (C).No.2946/2014. As per the said judgment, the writ petition was dismissed subject to certain observations. It was made specifically clear thereunder that dismissal of the writ petition would not stand in the way of the petitioners therein to bring to the notice of the respondents any incident of unauthorised slaughtering and vending of meat within the limits of the Municipality and in case the petitioners bring to the notice of the authorities any such illegal activities, respondents shall take appropriate steps in accordance with law. Essentially, it is contended that though such instances of illegal activities were brought to the notice of the authorities ignoring the

specific directions in that regard, no steps were taken in accordance with law.

2.The respondent has filed a counter affidavit. It is specifically stated therein that certain representations carrying allegations regarding the illegal activities in the matter of slaughtering and vending of meat have been received by the respondents and for the purpose of ascertaining the verity of such allegations, inspections were caused through Health Inspectors. It is further stated therein that such inspections revealed that there is no substance in the allegations.

3.A reply affidavit has been filed by the petitioner. I have carefully gone through the same. However, no specific instance of unauthorised slaughtering or illegal vending of meat is discernible from the averments in the reply affidavit. In such circumstances, taking note of the fact that pursuant to the receipt of representations from the petitioner, inspections were conducted through Health

Inspectors to ascertain the correctness of the allegations and also the stand taken by them that whenever unauthorised instance of slaughtering or vending of meat comes to the knowledge of the authorities they would take appropriate action in terms of the judgment, I am of the view that there is no reason to proceed further with this proceedings. In such circumstances, this contempt case is closed. However, it is made clear that in terms of the directions in Annexure-A judgment, whenever and wherever there is unauthorised slaughtering or illegal vending of meat, the respondent is bound to take appropriate action, in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
C.T. RAVIKUMAR
(JUDGE)**

spc/

C.T. RAVIKUMAR, J.

JUDGMENT

C.O.(C).1470/15

5

September, 2010