

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**CONTEMPT CASE No.984 OF 2017**

**DATED : 02.11.2017**

Between :

Mohd. Allauddin S/o.Late Md.Azeemuddin,  
Aged 47 yrs, Occu : Driver, APSRTC-800 033,  
Of Gajwel Pregnapur Depot,  
Medak District,  
R/o.H.NO.6-36/2, Yerrakunta, Barkas,  
Hyderabad-05.

.. Petitioner

And

Sri B. Paul Garu,  
Depot Manager, TSRTC, Gajwel,  
Pragnapur Depot, Medak District,  
(After bifurcation, Siddipet District)

.. Respondent



This court made the following :

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**CONTEMPT CASE No.984 OF 2017**

**ORDER :**

W.P.No.19847 of 2013, C.C.Nos.604 of 2016 and 1863 of 2014 was disposed of by common order dated 01.03.2017, declaring that petitioner is entitled to salary and periodical increments for the period when he was put off duty till he was provided alternative employment and he is entitled to salary for the period from January, 2016 to May, 2016. The Court directed to work out arrears of amounts due and payable and be paid to the petitioner within eight weeks from the date of receipt of the order. Aggrieved by the said decision, the respondent-Corporation filed W.A.No.914 of 2017. By judgment dated 28.08.2017, the writ appeal was allowed setting aside the order in writ petition. However, the Division Bench granted liberty to the petitioner to submit a detail representation to the Corporation and further direction was issued to the respondent-Corporation to pass speaking orders.

2. This contempt is filed alleging disobedience of the directions issued by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.19847 of 2013.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner made extensive submissions on merits of the claim.

4. In contempt proceedings this Court is only concerned with the compliance of the orders passed. When the judgment in W.P.No.19847 of 2013 is set aside by the Division Bench, it cannot be said that the respondents have disobeyed the order made in

W.P.No.19847 of 2013 warranting initiation of contempt proceedings.

5. Contempt case is accordingly closed leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedies as available in law, and if so advised, seek enforcement of the direction issued by the Division Bench. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

2<sup>nd</sup> November 2017  
Rds

**P.NAVEEN RAO,J**

