

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO

CONTEMPT CASE NO. 1176 OF 2014

-

ORDER:

This contempt case has been filed complaining that the judgment rendered by this Court in W.P.No.1552 of 2014 has not been complied with. It is seen from the operative portion of the judgment rendered in W.P.No.1552 of 2014 that this Court observed that the respondents 1 & 2 to consider the case of the petitioner sympathetically and extend the same treatment as has been given to the other contract workers, provided the petitioner gives an unconditional undertaking assuring the respondent management about his proper conduct during the course of his employment. The assertion of the petitioner is that, he has assured the Superintendent of the Osmania General Hospital that he will maintain decorous conduct henceforth and also tendered his apology for the behaviour exhibited in the past. His grievance is nonetheless, he has not been entertained to duty. As I could see from the material exhibited at page 19 of the paper book filed in this case, the Superintendent of the Osmania General Hospital and Aarogyasree Coordinator-cum-Head of the Department, Department of Medicine, Osmania General Hospital, Hyderabad, had endorsed that the petitioner may be entertained to duty, but that is not where the matter stops. The petitioner is an outsourced employee. His services have been made available by the third respondent, the Contractor and hence, it is for the Contractor to send the name of the petitioner once again. If the Contractor has sponsored the name of the petitioner herein and if the respondents 1 & 2 have not entertained him to duty, perhaps, one can understand the grievance nurtured by the petitioner against them, but not otherwise. Therefore, it is open to the petitioner to pursue his remedy vis-à-vis the third respondent. I do not find any deliberate, wanton or willful act or neglect on the part of the respondents 1 & 2 for me to proceed and initiate action under the Contempt of Courts Act.

Hence, this contempt case stands dismissed.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending shall also stand dismissed. No costs.

The respondents 1 & 2 stands completely discharged from the notice in the above contempt case.

JUSTICE NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO

28.01.2015

sp