

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRA

TUESDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/21ST MAGHA, 1936

Con.Case(C).No.1259 of 2014 (S) IN WP(C).30347/2013

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 30347/2013 OF
HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED 18.3.2014

PETITIONERS/PETITIONERS IN THE WRIT PETITION (C):

-
1. DR.B.RAMESHKUMAR, AGED 51 YEARS,
S/O.LATE SHRI.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,
SENIOR SCIENTIFIC ASSISTANT,
KERALA STATE REMOTE SENSING AND ENVIRONMENT CENTRE,
VIKAS BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
RESIDING AT 'PAVITHRAM', TC 8/1420 (3), ARAYALLOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
 2. DR.R.V.SHEEJA,
AGED 43 YEARS,
W/O.G.RAMESH KUMAR, SENIOR SCIENTIFIC ASSISTANT,
KERALA STATE REMOTE SENSING AND ENVIRONMENT CENTRE,
VIKAS BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
RESIDING AT 'KRISHNA KRIPA', THOPPUMUKKU,
VATTIYOORKKAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM – 13.

BY ADV. SRI.B.UNNIKRISHNA KAIMAL

RESPONDENT/1ST RESPONDENT IN THE WRIT PETITION (C):

SRI.MARAPANDYAN, I.A.S., AGED 56 YEARS,
FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM – 695 001.
RESIDING AT THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.MOHAMMED SAVAD

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 10-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' ANNEXURES:-

- ANNEXURE-I : CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT
DTD.18.3.2014 OF THIS COURT IN W.P.(C)
No.30347/13.P.
- ANNEXURE-II : COPY OF THE G.O.(Ms)No.42/14/Plg.
DTD.17.9.2014.

REPOENDENT'S ANNEXURES :-

- ANNEXURE-I : COPY OF THE G.O.(Ms)NO.42/14/Plg.
DTD.17.9.2014.
- ANNEXURE-II : COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE OF KERALA STATE REMOTE
SENSING AND ENVIRONMENT CENTRE HELD
ON 31.12.2014.
- ANNEXURE-III : TRUE COPY OF THE G.O.(Rt)No.58/15/Plg.
DTD.29.1.2015.

True copy

P.A to Judge

ANIL K.NARENDRA, J.

Con.Case (Civil) No.1259 of 2014

in

W.P.(C)No.30347 of 2013

Dated this the 10th day of February, 2015

JUDGMENT

This contempt of court case has been filed by the petitioners in W.P.(C)No.30347 of 2013 alleging that the respondent herein has committed wilful disobedience of Annexure-I judgment of this Court dated 18.3.2014 in that Writ Petition.

2. I heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioners and also the learned Government pleader appearing for the respondent.

3. By Annexure-I judgment the Writ Petition filed by the petitioners herein was disposed of by directing the respondent herein to take appropriate decision on the proposal made by the 2nd respondent in Ext.P14 letter dated 20.6.2013 regarding promotion of Scientific Staff in the Kerala State Remote Sensing and Environment Centre by upgrading the respective posts occupied by the petitioners and other Scientific staff, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate within a period of one month from the date of

receipt of a copy of the judgment. Similarly, the respondent herein was further directed to take a decision on the proposal made by the Director of the Kerala State Remote Sensing and Environment Centre for sanctioning 8th and 9th pay revision benefits to the Scientific staff of that Centre.

4. The grievance of the petitioners in this Contempt of Court Case was that, inspite of the specific direction contained in Annexure-I judgment, the respondent issued Annexure-II order in which the entitlement of the Scientific staff for sanctioning of 8th and 9th pay revision benefits alone was considered. During the pendency of this contempt of court case the respondent has issued Annexure-III order dated 29.1.2015 on the proposal made by the 2nd respondent in Ext.P14 letter dated 20.6.2013, regarding promotion of Scientific staff of the Centre by upgrading the respective posts occupied by the petitioners and other Scientific staff.

If the petitioners are aggrieved by Annexure-III order passed by the respondent, it is for them to challenge the same in an appropriate proceedings. Therefore, this contempt of court case is

Con.Case (Civil) No.1259 of 2014
in
W.P.(C)No.30347 of 2013

3

closed in view of Annexure-III order passed by the respondent. But it is made clear that the closure of this contempt of court case will not stand in the way of the petitioners challenging Annexure-III order passed by the respondent in appropriate proceedings.

ANIL K.NARENDRA, JUDGE

skj