

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAJASHEKER REDDY**

CONTEMPT CASE No.195 of 2014

-
ORDER: (Per Justice R. Subhash Reddy)

Wilful disobedience on the part of the respondents in complying the directions of this court in the order dated 08.08.2013 passed in W.A.No.570 of 2012 is the complaint in this contempt case filed under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

2. The learned single Judge in W.P.No.24377 of 2010, by order dated 08.09.2010, issued directions to the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioners from the date of their completing 10 years of service. Further directions are issued to put them on timescale from 01.09.2010 with notional increments from the date of regularization, while making it clear that petitioners are not entitled for any arrears of increments and revised pay-scales etc. On appeal by the respondent-Corporation, the order of the learned single Judge is confirmed by common judgment dated 10.06.2013 passed in W.A.Nos.782 and 854 of 2012.

3. When this matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the respondents, while producing a copy of proceedings No.P1/876(04)/2007-RM:KR dated 10.12.2014, states that the directions of this court, of

which violation is alleged, have been complied.

4. From the material placed before us, it is clear that the benefit of notional increments is not given from March, 2013 and basic pay is shown as Rs.5,670/- without extending the benefit of notional increments. It is also brought to our notice by the learned counsel for the respondents that, complaining violation of the directions of the learned single Judge, contempt case is filed before the learned single Judge in C.C.No.1895 of 2014.

5. In view of the proceedings dated 10.12.2014, and further, in view of pendency of the contempt case filed complaining violation of the directions issued by the learned single Judge, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to proceed further.

6. Accordingly, we close this contempt case, with liberty to the petitioners to pursue the contempt case before the learned single Judge.

R. SUBHASH REDDY, J

A. RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

February 6, 2015
MRR