

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH

FRIDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF FEBRUARY TWO
THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

-
Present

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-
CONTEMPT CASE No.495 of 2014

Between:

D. Venkataramana, S/o. Venkataiah,
Aed about 48 years, R/o. 5-256, 7th Cross,
Bharata Mitta, Pakala,
Chittoor District.

.. Petitioner

AND

Ramakrishna, S/o. Not known to petitioner,
Aged Major,
The Superintendent of Police,
Chittoor District, Chittoor.

.. Respondent

The Court made the following:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

-

-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.495 of 2014

-

ORDER:

On a complaint given by the petitioner on 16.12.2013 regarding seizure of his motor transport vehicle bearing No.AP 16TU 2152 as no action was taken, the W.P.No.38770 of 2013 is instituted. This Court, by order, dated 31.12.2013, disposed of the writ petition directing the Superintendent of Police, Chittoor District, Chittoor, to take a decision on the representation of the petitioner, dated 16.12.2013, pass appropriate orders and communicate the same to the petitioner within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

2. Alleging that in spite of time fixed by this Court and even though the order copy was received long ago, no orders are passed, this contempt case is filed.

3. After the issuance of notice, the respondent passed orders on 27.01.2015 on the representation submitted by the petitioner and enclosing the same, counter affidavit is filed.

4. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, there was no action taken on the representation submitted by the petitioner for a long time in spite of specific time fixed by the Court and only on 27.01.2015, the order is passed

and the same is enclosed to the counter affidavit. The copy was not communicated to the petitioner.

5. It is unfortunate that the authorities concerned do not take action within the time fixed by the Court nor do they come before the Court seeking extension of time, if they have genuine difficulty in taking decisions within the time fixed by the Court. This is one classic example of such inordinate delay in taking decisions in spite of the Court fixing time for taking decision on the grievance of the individual. Be that as it may, the direction issued by the Court was only to pass orders on the representation submitted by the petitioner and on 27.01.2015 the orders are passed. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner disputes the correctness of the decision taken as contained in 27.01.2015 proceedings, in contempt proceedings, such merits of the decision cannot be gone into.

6. Thus, the Contempt Case is closed leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedies as available in law aggrieved by the decision stated in 27.01.2015 proceedings of the Superintendent of Police, Chittoor (respondent). There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this contempt case shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO,

J

Date: 20th February, 2015

KL



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.495 of 2014

Date: 20th February, 2015

KL