

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1940 OF 2017

Dated:08.12.2017

Between:

Ms. Nagasai Sriramy, aged 18 years,
Occ: Student, rep., by her Father and
Natural Guardian Sri M. Srinivas Rao,
R/o.Plot No.73, Hastinapur Colony,
Central, L.B. Nagar, Hyderabad

.. Petitioner

And

Sri Rajeshwar Tiwari, the State of
Telangana Health, Medical and Family
Welfare, Principal Secretary, Secretariat,
Saifabad, Hyderabad and another

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**CONTEMPT CASE No.1940 OF 2017****ORDER:**

On 18.05.2017, while admitting W.P.No.16700 of 2017, this Court granted interim direction as prayed for on the basis of the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner to the effect that petitioner required urgent treatment of Enzyme Replacement Therapy called Naglazyme and unless such therapy was administered, there was threat to her life. The interim prayer sought was to provide medical treatment of Enzyme Replacement Therapy with recombinant galsulfase enzyme. Alleging disobedience of the said direction, this Contempt Case is filed.

2. On behalf of the 2nd respondent, counter affidavit is filed explaining the steps taken to procure the medicine and as soon as the Medical Superintendent of Gandhi Hospital requests for supply of medicine, the said medicine would be supplied.

3. In the additional affidavit filed by the Superintendent, Gandhi Hospital, Hyderabad, he has explained in detail the various steps taken to administer treatment on the patient. According to the averments of the affidavit, an Expert Medical Board was constituted and the said Board examined the patient and advised not to administer the medicine as it may have other complications. According to the Superintendent, Gandhi Hospital, since Expert Medical Board advised against administering the medicine, it is decided not to administer medicine on the patient. A copy of the opinion of the Expert Medical Board is enclosed to the affidavit.

4. In view of the said averments, it cannot be said that the respondents have committed contempt.

5. The Contempt Case is accordingly closed. However, it is open to the petitioner to take appropriate steps with reference to the treatment that she is required.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:08.12.2017

KH

