

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

* * * *

CONTEMPT CASE No.1904 of 2014

BETWEEN

Pakala Srihari Rao.

... PETITIONER

AND

Sri Rahul Bojja, District Collector, Sangareddy, Medak District .

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 05.02.2016

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

&

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

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

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

As per our order dated 10.04.2015, the party-in-person has filed a

fresh list of specific case for re-examination and reconsideration for extension of benefit of G.O.Ms.No.421 dated 01.06.2004.

We had asked the District Collector to get the said cases re-examined and file a report. A report, accordingly, was filed before us on 21.08.2015, which was perused by us and as the party-in-person was not available, we have recorded as follows:

"In pursuance of our dated 10.04.2015, learned Government Pleader reports on the basis of instructions of the District Collector, Medak, that the committee has reconsidered 354 cases submitted by the petitioner out of which, on scrutiny, 47 cases were found to have already been granted relief and 18 cases are found eligible and relief under G.O.Ms.No.421 dated 01.06.2014 was granted to them. Remaining 278 cases are stated to have been rejected by DLVC.

- It is evident that our order aforesaid is substantially complied with. However, the party-in-person is not present.

- List after four (4) weeks."

_____ Today, also there is no appearance on behalf of party-in-person.

-

2. Since we find that out of 354 cases, on scrutiny, 47 cases were found to have been already granted relief and 18 cases are found eligible and relief under G.O.Ms.No.421 dated 01.06.2014 was granted. However, remaining 278 cases have been rejected by the committee. In view of that, since the order of this Court has been substantially complied with, we see no reason to further entertain this contempt case. So far as individual cases, which are rejected,

are concerned, it is open to such individuals to separately agitate their claim, if any.

-

_____ The contempt case is dismissed with the liberty aforesaid.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

-

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

-

February 5, 2016
DSK

-
-
-
S. RAVI KUMAR, J