

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G. SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION No.17050 of 2016

-
Date: 02.06.2016

Between:

The Deputy Commissioner of Prohibition & Excise,
Kurnool, and two others.

.. Petitioners

and

B. Sreeramulu, S/o. Pedda Rogenna,
Occ: Prohibition & Excise Sub Inspector,
Prohibition & Excise Station,
Tadipatri, Ananthapur District, and another.

.. Respondents

Counsel for the petitioners: G.P for Services (AP)

Counsel for respondent No.1 :

-
-
-

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

ORDER: *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)*

This writ petition arises out of order dated 12.09.2014 in
O.A.No.3015 of 2011 on the file of the Andhra Pradesh
Administrative Tribunal at Hyderabad (for short 'the Tribunal').

For disposal of this writ petition, the detailed facts need not be

recorded. It will suffice to note that the Tribunal has directed the petitioners to include the name of respondent No.1 in the seniority list of Prohibition and Excise Sub-Inspectors of Police, Kurnool Zone dated 21.04.2011 by taking into consideration his revised date of promotion i.e., 11.02.2009 and then consider his case for promotion to the post of Prohibition and Excise Inspector by applying rule of reservation in the panel year 2008-09 with all consequential benefits.

The learned Government Pleader for Services (AP) submitted that the impugned order was complied with by the petitioners in its letter and spirit and that still the Tribunal is insisting on allowing a higher relief to respondent No.1 than what was actually granted to him by it, in the contempt case filed by the said respondent.

The learned Government Pleader has not pointed out any error in the directions issued by the Tribunal in O.A.No.3015 of 2011. Hence the impugned order is not liable to be interfered with. If the petitioners have complied with the impugned order, they can resist the contempt application before the Tribunal. This Court at this stage cannot predict the result of the contempt application or the manner in which the Tribunal is likely to interpret its own order in the said contempt application and issue directions to the Tribunal to act in any particular manner in the contempt proceedings pending before it. It is needless to observe that if any order adverse to the interest of the petitioners is passed in the contempt application, by all means they can avail an appropriate legal remedy.

With these observations, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

As a sequel, WPMP.No.20988 of 2016, filed by the petitioners for interim relief stands disposed of as infructuous.

(C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J)

-

(G. SHYAM PRASAD, J)

Date: 02.06.2016

va