

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1746 OF 2017

DATED : 11.12.2017

Between :

B.V.S. Srinivas S/o.Late Dharma Rao,
Aged 41 yrs, Occu : Typist (under order
of Dismissal) O/o.Assistant Accounts Officer,
Electricity Revenue Office, A.P.E.P.D.C.Limited,
Nidadavolu, West Godavari District, A.P.

..

Petitioner

And

Sri P. Nageswara Rao,
Chief General Manager (HRD),
Andhra Pradesh Eastern Power Distribution Company Limited,
Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam District,
Andhra Pradesh & another.

..

Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1746 OF 2017

ORDER :

This contempt case is filed to punish the respondents for wilful violation and disobedience of the order of this Court in W.P.No.4144 of 2015 dated 21.04.2017.

2. This Court disposed of W.P.No.4144 of 2015 directing the respondents to reinstate the petitioner into service forthwith. With reference to back wages and other benefits, petitioner was granted liberty to make a representation and on submission of such representation, the Chief General Manager was directed to examine the same and pass appropriate orders, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of such representation. This Court further directed to pay, pay and allowances from the date of submission of representation dated 09.03.2013 till reinstatement.

3. Both the counsel state that the order is complied with. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is delay in compliance and the same is not satisfactorily explained and further, though there is an order of appearance, the respondents have not appeared.

4. In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the 2nd respondent, various steps taken by him is explained. According to the averments, petitioner made representation on 22.05.2017 and in terms of the directions of this Court, the compliance was required to be made within two months. Whereas, actually the order was passed on 21.09.2017 and there is short delay. Further with

reference to pay and allowances, as the petitioner was removed from service in the year 2004, the old record was required to be verified and the process consumed time and ultimately all the issues are now settled.

5. The respondents in their respective affidavits tendered unconditional apologies, for not complying with the order of this Court, within the time granted.

6. Having regard to the explanation offered by the 2nd respondent for the delay in complying with the order of this Court, and the unconditional apology offered by both the respondents, the same is accepted and the respondents are discharged from the contempt proceedings.

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.

11th December, 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J