

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.805 OF 2016

Dated:27.06.2017

Between:

Smt. Urmila, W/o. Late Satyanarayana
Singh, aged about 58 years,
Occ: Housewife, R/o.H.No.12-1-344,
Part Dattatreya Nagar, Asif Nagar,
Hyderabad

.. Petitioner

And

Dr. B. Janardhan Reddy,
Commissioner, Greater Hyderabad
Municipal Corporation, Tank Bund
Road, Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.805 OF 2016

ORDER:

This Court by order 03.08.2015 disposed of W.P.No.24102 of 2015 directing respondents 1 to 3 to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 22.05.2015 and after affording reasonable opportunity to the 4th respondent to pass appropriate orders as warranted by law within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and communicate the decision to the petitioner.

2. Alleging inaction on the representation submitted by the petitioner, this Contempt Case is filed.

3. The stand of the respondents in the counter affidavit filed by them is that encroachment was removed in the presence of the petitioner and as on today there is no such encroachment.

4. The petitioner filed reply affidavit stating that encroachment was not removed and further construction is being undertaken by the 4th respondent in the Writ Petition.

5. On behalf of the respondents, rejoinder is filed. Along with the rejoinder, a copy of the letter dated 23.06.2017 is enclosed, which is addressed to Smt. Urmila, the petitioner in the contempt case and the writ petitioner. The letter is in response to the representation stated to have been filed by the petitioner on 22.05.2015. Petitioner was informed on several aspects agitated in the representation including removal of steps projecting into the

public road. Along with the rejoinder, photographs are also enclosed to show that steps are removed.

6. In the counter affidavit filed by the respondents, same thing is reiterated.

7. Having regard to the orders passed, the Court is satisfied that there is compliance of the directions issued by this Court. However, the Court expresses its displeasure in communicating the decision made only on 23.06.2017, whereas the Writ Petition was disposed of on 03.08.2015 granting only four weeks time from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. No explanation is forthcoming for the delay in compliance of the said direction.

8. The Contempt Case is accordingly closed.

Date:27.06.2017

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

