

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

* * * *

CONTEMPT CASE No.1143 of 2013

BETWEEN

S.A. Karimullah.

... PETITIONER

AND

Mr. Abdul Hameed, Chief Executive Officer, A.P. State Wakf Board,
Haj House Building, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 07.11.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

&

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. SUNIL CHOWDARY

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be No
allowed to see the Judgments?
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked No
to Law Reporters/Journals?
3. Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the No
fair copy of the Judgment?

ORDER: (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Vilas V. Afzulpurkar)

This contempt case is filed alleging violation of the orders of this Court dated 17.12.2012 in PIL.No.245 of 2012.

2. The aforesaid public interest litigation was disposed of with the following direction:

“While taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the averments made by the 2nd respondent in the counter affidavit, we do not think that any further order can be passed in this petition. However, we only direct the 2nd respondent-Board also to look into the matter and if it finds that the 4th respondent-committee is not managing the affairs of the mosque in question properly, then the 2nd respondent-Board shall take necessary steps in the matter in accordance with law.”

3. Counter affidavit is filed by the Ex-Chief Executive Officer (FAC) of the A.P. State Wakf Board stating that the respondent-board has taken necessary action by invoking Section 65 of the Wakf Act,

as per the directions of this Court and appointed an enquiry officer on the irregularities allegedly committed by the fourth respondent-committee. A report of the enquiry officer dated 21.08.2014 was received, which has already been considered by the respondent-board and the allegations against the fourth respondent-committee including the allegation of misappropriation were found to be factually incorrect and on the contrary, the fourth respondent-committee is stated to have rendered good services to build a new mosque and the services of the fourth respondent-committee have also been recognized and appreciated by representatives of the people.

4. The counter affidavit, aforesaid, shows due compliance of the directions of this Court and hence, nothing further survives for consideration in the contempt case.

The contempt case is accordingly dismissed. The miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

T. SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

November 7, 2015

DSK