

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

THURSDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/25TH POUSHA, 1936

Con.Case(C).No. 1246 of 2014 (S)

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 30527/2012 OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT
DATED 26-03-2014.**

PETITIONER/IST PETITIONER :

**KERALA VARMA THAMPAN B.L., AGED 70 YEARS,
S/O P.BHAGAVATHI IYER, THEKKEDATHU KOVILAKAM,
CHENGALAM SOUTH P.O., KOTTAYAM – 686 022,
NOW RESIDING AT NANDHANAM, KANJOOR P.O.,
ERNAKULAM – 687 535.**

**BY SENIOR ADVOCATE SRI. K. JAJU BABU
BY ADV. SMT. M.U. VIJAYALAKSHMI**

RESPONDENT/IST RESPONDENT :

**SRI. K.R. JYOTHILAL, I.A.S.,
(AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER)
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM – 695 001.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT. SUNITHA VINOD

**THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 15-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' ANNEXURES :

**ANNEXURE A : COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER GO(MS)
NO. 348/2012/GAD DATED 4.12.2012.**

**ANNEXURE B COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 27.3.2014 SUBMITTED
BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENT.**

**ANNEXURE C COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 26.3.2014 IN WP(C)
NO. 30527/2012 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.**

**ANNEXURE D COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER GO(RT)
NO. 8113/2014/GAD DATED 20.10.2014.**

RESPONDENT'S ANNEXURES : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

=====

Cont. Case (C) No.1246 of 2014

in

W.P(C) No.30527 of 2012

=====

Dated this the 15th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The contempt of court case is filed alleging that the respondents have committed grave disobedience to the judgment of this Court.

2. This Court while disposing of the writ petition permitted the petitioners to approach the first respondent with a proper representation within a period of one month from that date, claiming the benefit of Ext.P10 order in that writ petition. It was directed that in the event of filing such a representation, the same shall be considered favourably by the respondent Government after affording the authorised representatives of the petitioners' families an opportunity of being heard. A time frame was also fixed.

3. Today, the learned Government Pleader submitted that as directed by this Court in the judgment, the matter has been re-

considered by the respondent and it was decided against the petitioner.

4. It was argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that there was a specific direction in the judgment to consider the case of the petitioner favourably. It is true that the petitioner's case was not considered favourably though there was a direction to that effect in the judgment.

5. However, as orders have been passed in compliance of the directions of this Court and there is substantial compliance, this Court is of the definite view that this contempt of court case can be closed. It shall be open to the petitioner to challenge the present orders passed by the respondent in appropriate proceedings.

With the aforesaid observations, this Cont. Case (C) is closed.

Sd/-

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

krj