

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.2535 OF 2016

DATED : 19.12.2017

Between :

Dr.T.Dayakar Rao S/o.Venkat Rao,
Aged about 56 yrs, Occu : Asst. Professor in History,
Kakatiya University, Hanamkonda,
Warangal District.

..

Petitioner

And

Prof. M.V.Ranga Rao, S/o.Not known to the petitioner,
Registrar, Kakatiya University,
Hanamkonda, Warangal District & another

..

Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.2535 OF 2016

ORDER :

By order dated 24.11.2015 this Court directed the respondents to pass appropriate orders on the representations dated 07.12.2010, 08.02.2011, 08.03.2011, and 23.04.2011 of the petitioner, pursuant to the orders passed in W.P.No.29022 of 2010 and regularize the services with retrospective effect as was done in the case of Dr.B.Krishna Rao, Assistant Professor in Chemistry and others. Alleging violation of the said direction, this contempt case is filed.

2. Learned Standing counsel produced proceedings dated 18.07.2017 where under, the Registrar, informed the petitioner about the decision taken on the representations made and his entitlement.

3. The Court is not going into the details of not assigning the reasons, as the direction was only to consider the representations and to take a decision.

4. As there was inordinate delay in taking the decision, the Court directed the respondent-Registrar to file an affidavit explaining the reasons for delay.

5. As directed, it is now stated in the affidavit that the Vice-Chancellor demitted the office on 17.05.2014 and there was no regular Vice-Chancellor till the end of July, 2016. It is further stated that ever since the appointment of the present Vice-Chancellor, all long pending issues were taken up and being

cleared. It is therefore, stated that the delay occurred on account of the above stated circumstances. In the affidavit filed, it is not explained as to whether in the absence of regular Vice-Chancellor, there was any in-charge Vice-Chancellor and that the Registrar would not take any decision on the direction issued by this Court. Further, if there is difficulty in taking decision, the Registrar ought to have sought extension of time before this Court.

6. Thus, while accepting the apology, the Registrar is warned to be careful in future in dealing with the Court cases.

7. Accordingly, the Contempt case is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

19th December, 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

