

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE (TR) No.1 OF 2017

Dated:19.07.2017

Between:

G. Padmakar, S/o. Chakdrapani,
Aged about 55 years, Occ: Inspector,
Legal Metrology, Mancherial,
Adilabad District

.. Petitioner

And

The Government of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep., by its Principal Secretary,
Food and Civil Supplies Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and another

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**CONTEMPT CASE (TR) No.1 OF 2017****ORDER:**

C.A.No.258 of 2010 is instituted before the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal alleging violation of the directions dated 07.10.2005 issued in O.A.No.4671 of 2003, transferred to this Court and renumbered as C.C. (TR).No.1 of 2017.

2. On instructions, learned Government Pleader for Services – II submits that there were two persons, namely, B. Kishan and P.Kishan, whose promotions are to be declared as illegal and to be reverted insofar as the petitioner's claim is concerned. On 26.04.2016, orders were passed reverting the said two persons. It is further stated that B. Kishan was subsequently dismissed from service. Aggrieved by the order of reversion, P. Kishan filed O.A.No.4110 of 2012. The said O.A. was dismissed on 06.04.2016. Aggrieved thereby, P. Kishan filed W.P.No.38273 of 2016. The Division Bench of this Court by order dated 08.11.2016, granted interim stay of reversion. Learned Government Pleader therefore submits that no further steps were taken on account of stay granted by this Court in W.P.No.38273 of 2016 and P. Kishan continued to work in accordance with the original promotion granted to him.

3. It is further stated that the two persons, whose names are mentioned in the C.A., have also invoked the jurisdiction of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal challenging the order of reversion against them and they are continuing in the same posts

by virtue of the interim orders granted by the Tribunal, which O.As. are pending and transferred to this Court.

4. Having regard to the said submission, it cannot be said that the respondents have willfully and deliberately violated the orders of the Tribunal warranting initiation of contempt proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

5. The Contempt Case (TR) is accordingly closed. It is open to the petitioner to work out his remedies in the pending Writ Petitions before this Court.

Date:19.07.2017

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

