

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1835 OF 2017

DATED : 11.12.2017

Between :

Mohd. S/o.Ameer Basha,
Age 48 yrs, Occu : Daily Wage Worker,
Govt. SW Boys Hostel,
Karanked Tandu Mandal,
Vikarabad Mandal, R.R. District & others.


..

Petitioners

And

Sri Raghunandan Rao,
District Collector (SW),
Ranga Reddy District, Lakidikapool, Hyderabad & others.

Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1835 OF 2017

ORDER :

This Court passed the following order in W.P.M.P.No.14975 of 2017 in W.P.No.12030 of 2017 on 06.04.2017 :

“Subject to determination of petitioners eligibility to hold regular post and if the petitioners are working against the regular post, respondents are directed to grant the minimum time scale of pay attached to the said post.”

2. Alleging violation of the said direction and minimum wages are not paid, this contempt case is filed.

3. Counter affidavit is filed by the 2nd respondent. Along with the counter affidavit, proceedings dated 21.09.2017 is enclosed. Earlier on a reading of the above proceedings, the Court was of the opinion that what is communicated therein concerns only the claim for regularization and whereas the direction issued by the Court was payment of minimum time scale of pay attached to the post and the order has not dealt with that issue, the contempt case was admitted and officer was directed to appear before this Court.

4. Learned Government Pleader, now clarifies that though order *prima-facie* deals with regularization claim under G.O.212, it also deals with the claim for grant of minimum time scale of pay on the ground that the petitioners are not holding regular/sanctioned post.

5. A bare perusal of the order passed by this Court would show that this Court directed to grant minimum time scale of pay attached to the post, if the petitioners are working against the regular post.

6. In view of the clarification given by learned Government Pleader, it cannot be said that the respondents have violated the directions of this Court, warranting initiation of proceedings of contempt under the Contempt of Courts Act.

7. Having regard to the above, the respondents are discharged from the contempt proceedings and accordingly, the Contempt Case is closed. However, it is always open to the petitioners to work out their remedies as available in law. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this contempt case shall stand closed.

11th December, 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

