

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

CC.No.852 of 2015

Between:

Gayathri Seva Samithi

-

... Petitioner/Appellant (s)

and

Mr.Veera Pandyan.

-

... Respondent (s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 11.08.2015

-

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1 | <u>Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments?</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |
|
 | | |
| 2 | <u>Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reports/Journals</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |
|
 | | |
| 3 | <u>Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |

-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE No.852 OF 2015

-

ORDER:

This Contempt Case is filed alleging violation of the order dated 26.03.2015, passed by this Court in WP.No.6682 of 2015, wherein this Court directed the competent authority to consider the representation submitted by the petitioner and pass orders in accordance with law, within two weeks.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner who submits that

though the respondent passed orders on 01.07.2015, in pursuance to the orders passed by this Court in WP.No.6682 of 2015, the same is not in accordance with law. Hence there is violation of the orders passed by this Court.

On the other hand Sri T.Bala Swamy, learned standing counsel for the respondent submits that by virtue of Section 528(1) of the HMC Act, the order dated 01.07.2015 has been passed.

In this case, may be the order passed by the respondent is wrong order, but under contempt jurisdiction, the validity of the order cannot be decided. The same can be challenged in the appropriate proceedings. In view of the same, I do not see any violation of order passed by this Court.

Accordingly, the contempt case is dismissed. However, it is open for the petitioner to challenge the proceedings dated 01.07.2015 issued by the respondent by way of separate proceedings and establish his case. No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in the writ petition shall stand closed.

A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

11.08.2015
tk