

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

CONTEMPT CASE No.1163 of 2016

ORDER:

The contempt case is filed complaining disobedience of order dated 23.03.2016 in WP.No.5118 of 2016. The order dated 23.03.2016 is a very brief order and for convenience, the same is reproduced hereunder:

“The petitioner complains against inaction of 8th respondent in disposing of representations, dated 07-03-2015, 07-04-2016, 09-07-2015, 10-07-2015, 21-07-2015 and 22-01-2016 under the provisions of the A.P. Co-operative Societies Act, 1964 (for short “the Act”) as illegal and amounts to refusing to exercise jurisdiction conferred on the 8th respondent.

On receipt of notice, 8th respondent filed detailed counter and replied the inaction complained in the writ petition. 8th respondent stated as follows:-

“As per the request of the petitioner, the necessary material sought by the petitioner has been furnished to her. It is submitted that copies of representations made by the petitioner are referred to 10th respondent (sic 9th respondent) for pursuing appropriate alternative remedy under law.”

The representations of the petitioner, therefore, are attended to.

Having regard to the action referred to above, I am not considering the grievance of petitioner but the petitioner is given liberty to approach the authorities under the Act by raising a dispute etc., if so advised or pursue the remedy of enquiry under Section 51 by complying with the statutory requirement.

With the above observation, the writ petition is disposed of.
No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.”

2. *Prima facie*, it appears, this Court while disposing of the writ petition, except giving liberty to petitioner to work out remedies either before the authorities or before the tribunal did not consider the issue on merits much less any direction was issued for compliance by the respondents. The allegation in the contempt case is certainly not available and the objection is rightly pointed out in the counter affidavit dated 30.08.2016.

The contempt case fails and is dismissed. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

September 8, 2016
DSK

S. V. BHATT, J

