

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1570 OF 2017

Dated:10.11.2017

Between:

Smt. D. Ramanjinamma @ Anjinamma,
W/o. Late D. Balanna, age 52 years,
Hindu, Occ: House Wife,
R/o.D.No.18-795-F16, Tilaknagar,
Guntakal, Anantapur District

.. Petitioner

And

Prabhakaran, S/o. Father's name not
Known to the petitioner, the Executive
Director, Food Corporation of India,
Zonal Office (South), Chennai,
Tamilnadu and others

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**CONTEMPT CASE No.1570 OF 2017****ORDER:**

By order dated 27.03.2017 in W.P.M.P.No.42423 of 2016 in W.P.No.34408 of 2016, this Court directed the respondents to take necessary action for payment of family pension along with the arrears to the petitioner at the earliest, pending disposal of the Writ Petition. Alleging inaction on the said directions, this Contempt Case is filed.

2. Counter affidavit is filed on behalf of the respondents. All the respondents herein are officers of the Food Corporation of India. The averments in the counter affidavit would disclose that the pension has to be sanctioned by the Employees Provident Fund (EPF) authority; appropriate proposals have been submitted by the Food Corporation of India; on scrutiny of the documents, the EPF authorities at New Delhi sought for certain documents to be furnished by the petitioner and there appears continuous correspondence by the Food Corporation of India with the petitioner, the latest being on 30.08.2017. The counter affidavit would also disclose that the petitioner has not furnished the documents/clarifications sought by the EPFO and without furnishing the said documents/clarifications, petitioner cannot blame the Food Corporation of India. Furthermore, as stated by the Food Corporation of India, pension sanctioning authority is EPF, whereas the EPF authority is not made party to the Writ Petition as well as to the Contempt Case.

3. In view of the specific stand of the Food Corporation of India, it cannot be said that there is violation of the directions issued by this Court much less deliberate and willful warranting initiation of the contempt proceedings.

4. The Contempt Case is accordingly dismissed.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:10.11.2017

KH

