

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDRA MOHAN

MONDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/29TH POUSHA, 1936

Con.Case(C).No. 345 of 2014 (S) IN WP(C).23576/2011

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C)NO.23576/2011 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 21-03-2012

PETITIONER/PETITIONER :

T.P.STANLY, S/O.T.A.PAILY AGED 61
RETIRED AS AN OPERATOR FROM KERALA WATER AUTHORITY
THANNIPPILLY HOUSE, MATHA NAGAR, KALOOR
COCHIN - 682 017.

BY ADV. SRI.ALEX THANNIPPILLY

RESPONDENT/2ND RESPONDENT IN WP(C) :

ASHOK SINGH
(FATHER'S NAME AND AGE ARE NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER)
THE MANAGING DIRECTOR, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY
JAL BHAVAN, VAZHUTHACADU, TRIVANDRUM
PIN:695 033.

R BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE MATHEW, SC, KERALA WATERAUTHORITY

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 19-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

Con.Case(C).No. 345 of 2014 (S) IN WP(C).23576/2011

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES :

ANNEXURE 1 : CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 21.3.2012 IN WRIT PETITION
(C) NO.23576/2011

ANNEXURE 2 : TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE LEGAL NOTICE DATED 19.3.2013

RESPONDENT'S ANNEXURES :

EXTR1(A) : TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.KWA/JB/E5/8046/12 DATED 10.9.2012

/TRUE COPY/

P.A TO JUDGE

AV

K.SURENDRA MOHAN, J.

Cont.Case(C) No.345 of 2014

Dated this the 19th day of January, 2015

J U D G M E N T

In compliance with the order dated 25.03.2014, an affidavit has been filed by the respondent producing Ext.R1(a), copy of the proceedings issued in compliance with the direction of this Court contained in Annexure-1 judgment. The respondent has also expressed regret in not complying with the same within the time limit stipulated by this Court.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that Ext.R1 (a) is illegal for the reason that, while other similarly situated employees have been granted the benefits, the petitioner has been denied the same.

3. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner cannot be countenanced in this case for the reason that, this is an action initiated for contempt of this Court. Since the direction of this Court has already been complied with, it is not necessary to proceed further in the matter. If the petitioner is aggrieved by Ext.R1(a), the proper remedy of the petitioner is to challenge the same in separate proceedings.

In view of the above, this contempt case is closed.

Sd/-

K.SURENDRA MOHAN, JUDGE.

AV