

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.711 OF 2016

DATED : 23.06.2017

Between :

Krishna Swamy S/o.Narayana Swamy,
Aged about 85f yrs, Occu : Architect and Engineer,
R/o.Sebastian Road, Secunderabad

..

Petitioner

And

Sri Janardhan Reddy,
Commissioner, Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation,
Near Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad

..

Respondent



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.711 OF 2016

ORDER :

This Court disposed of W.P.No.18453 of 2015 on 17.08.2015 directing the Commissioner, Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, to instruct the competent authority to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 03.06.2015 and pass suitable orders, as warranted by law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order. Alleging disobedience of the said orders, this contempt case is filed.

2. Taking note of the fact that there was no response even though notice was served and compliance was not reported, on 01.06.2017 this Court granted time to the learned Standing counsel for reporting compliance and on failure to report compliance, appearance of the Commissioner was ordered.

3. Learned Standing counsel produced letter dated 24.06.2016 addressed to Krishna Swamy informing him the decision taken on the representation. This letter is in compliance with the direction issued by this Court.

4. Learned Standing counsel also informs the Court that Krishna Swamy has accepted to take the compensation for 66.94 Square yards of land in Plot No.14 in T.S.No.2/2 and as per his consent, after determining market value, compensation amount was arrived at and steps were taken to make the payment. However, in the meantime, the family members of Krishna Swamy informed the competent authority of the respondent-Corporation that Krishna Swamy passed away. Therefore, the Corporation

could not disburse the amount and so far the legal heir certificate is not furnished to the Corporation.

5. The fact of death of petitioner is not informed to the Court and order passed by the Commissioner, GHMC on 24.06.2016, is also not informed to the Court. If the court was informed of these facts, court would not have ordered appearance of the Commissioner.

6. The conduct of the authorities of the respondent Corporation is also not appreciated. Even though a decision was taken on 24.06.2016 and even after service of notice in the contempt case, the Court was not apprised of the decision already taken. It appears even the learned Standing counsel was not apprised of the decision taken and the matter underwent adjournments to enable the learned Standing counsel to obtain instructions. The processing of this case speaks volumes of the manner in which the administration of the respondent Corporation is working. I hope the Commissioner will take note of the manner in which the cases are prosecuted in this Court.

7. Since the order of this Court is already complied, the Court is not persuaded to initiate proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act.

8. Accordingly, the Contempt case is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

23rd June, 2017

Note: Office is directed to communicate a copy of this Order to the Commissioner, Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Hyderabad.

b/o
Rds

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

139



CONTEMPT CASE.No.711 OF 2016

DATED :23.06.2017

Rds