

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.12.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

Contempt Petition Nos.2598 & 2616 of 2016

K.Rajamanickam

... Petitioner

(in Cont P.No.2598 of 2016)

G.Elumalai

... Petitioner

(in Cont P.No.2616 of 2016)

-Vs-

Mr.Sridharan
The Tahsildar
Avadi Taluk,
Thiruvallur District.

... Respondents

Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, for his willful disobedience of the orders of this Honourable Court dated 12.08.2014 & 12.08.2014 respectively and punish the respondent for not complying the orders of the Hon'ble Court in WP.Nos.21585 of 2014 & 21587 of 2014 respectively.

For Petitioner

: Ms.Aishwarya

M/s.R and P Partners

(in both contempt petitions)

For Respondent

: Mr.K.Dhananjayan

Special Government Pleader

(in both contempt petitions)

COMMON ORDER

These contempt petitions are filed by complaining that the orders passed in WP.Nos.21585 of 2014 & 21587 of 2014 have not been complied with.

2. This Court issued a statutory notice on 24.11.2017. Accordingly, the respondent is present before this Court today.

3. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent submitted that the orders passed by this Court in those writ petitions have been complied with, by passing an order dated 28.11.2017.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondent has only made certain recommendations without considering the petitioners' request for allotment of alternative living place and by the said proceedings, it is not known as to whether the orders passed by this Court in the respective writ petitions have been complied with or

not.

5. A Perusal of the order passed in the writ petitions would show that only a direction was issued to the respondent Tahsildar to consider the representation of the petitioners on merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. Now an order is passed. If the petitioners are still aggrieved against the said proceedings, it is always open to the petitioners to agitate the matter separately. In any event, the contempt petitions cannot be kept pending in view of the fact that the respondent has passed an order on 28.11.2017. Accordingly, these contempt petitions are closed, however, granting liberty to the petitioners to work out their remedy against the order passed by the respondent dated 28.11.2017 in the manner known to law.

22.12.2017

Speaking / Non-speaking order

Index: Yes/No

mk

WEB COPY

K.RAVICHANDRABAABU.J.,

mk



Contempt Petition Nos.2598 & 2616 of 2016

WEB COPY

22.12.2017