

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA KODANDA RAM

CONTEMPT CASE No.664 OF 2016

ORDER:

The Contempt Case is filed complaining the in action on the part of the respondent-authorities in complying the order dated 06.04.2016, passed by this Court in W.P.No.10965 of 2016.

The order reads as under:

“A perusal of the record reveals that as per the proceedings dated 27.08.2015 the respondent authorities have extended the lease period for the Stall No. S.30, for running cool drinks stall, for a period of three months with certain conditions and as it is the case of the petitioner that similarly situated persons have been extended the lease for a period of three months, the case of the petitioner shall also be considered by the respondent authorities.

With the above direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand closed.”

A counter-affidavit is filed by the 2nd respondent stating that the copy of the order passed by this Court was served on the respondents on 11.04.2016 and by which time in order to complete the construction work which was started in December, 2015, the shop was vacated by removing and keeping all the belongings of the petitioner in safe custody under the lock and key. It is also further denied that any representation having been made by the petitioner on 21.03.2016.

On perusal of the order dated 06.04.2016, passed by this Court in W.P.No.10965 of 2016, it is clear that this Court has directed only to consider the case of the petitioner, if there is any possibility of extending the lease period for the premises in question. Inasmuch as the shop itself has been dismantled in the process of modernisation, the case of the petitioner was not considered by the respondents and at any rate by

the date of passing of the order, the petitioner had vacated the premises in question. There is also no reply affidavit filed by the petitioner and apart from that what all has been directed in the writ petition is to consider the case of the petitioner, if there is any possibility of extension of lease for the premises in question. In that view of the matter, the contempt case is liable to be closed.

Accordingly, the contempt case is closed. No order as to costs.

CHALLA KODANDA RAM,J

Date:03.02.2017,
Gk.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA KODANDA RAM

CONTEMPT CASE No.664 OF 2016

Date:03.02.2017

Gk

