

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.ABDUL REHIM

WEDNESDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/13TH KARTHIKA, 1937

Con.Case(C).No. 1521 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).14761/2009

**-----
AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED 24-11-2014 IN WP(C) 14761/2009 of**

PETITIONER/WRIT PETITIONER IN W.P.(C):

**-----
RAMAIYAN.P,
AGED 73 YEARS, S/O. PADMANABHAN,
TC 19/902, BHAGYALAKSHMI, 254 KESAVA DEV ROAD,
MUDAVANMUGAL, THRIVIKRAMANGALAM, POOJAPPURA P.O.
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695012.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.T.P.DĒYANANTHAN
SRI.A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PANICKER**

RESPONDENT/1ST RESPONDENT:

**-----
K.K.JALAN
AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
BHAVISHYANIDHI BHAVAN, 14 BHIKAJI CAMA PLACE
NEW DELHI-110066.**

**BY ADVS. SRI.N.N.SUGUNAPALAN (SR.)
SMT.T.N.GIRIJA, SC,EPF ORGANISATION**

**THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 04-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

AMG

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE-A1- CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 24-11-2014 IN WPC No.14761/2009.

ANNEXURE-A2- TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER No.KR/TVM/PEN/CELL (4) PPO No.28881/2015 DATED 07-08-2015.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE-RI (a) - TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 06-03-2015 OF THE COUNSEL.

ANNEXURE-RI (b)- TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 31-10-2015 OF THE PETITIONER.

ANNEXURE-RI (c)- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 02-11-2015 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT.

True copy

P.A. To Judge

AMG

C.K. ABDUL REHIM, J.

Con. Case (c) No. 1521 OF 2015

DATED THIS THE 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

The respondent had filed IA No.449/2015 producing copy of an order passed by the respondent on 02-11-2015 issued in compliance with the directions contained in Annexure-A1 judgment. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the decision taken in the said order is not in accordance with the observations contained in the judgment. This court is of the opinion that, whether the observations contained in the judgment or the contentions raised by the petitioner were considered in its real perspective or not, is not a matter which can be adjudicated in this contempt of court case. It is always left open to the petitioner to challenge the order, if he is aggrieved. Since the respondent had already issued the order, there is no circumstances existing to proceed further under the Contempt of Courts Act.

2. Under the above mentioned circumstances, reserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the above said order, this contempt of court case is hereby closed.

Sd/-

C.K. ABDUL REHIM, JUDGE.

AMG

True copy
P.A. to Judge