

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.2513 of 2016

Date: June 27, 2017

Between:

G.Krishna Reddy, S/o.late G.Narayana Reddy
Aged about 65 years, Occ:Agriculture,
R/o.H.No.9-78/2, Burtonguda, near Bollaram
Railway Station, Secunderabad – 10.

... Petitioner

And

Sri M.V.Reddy, IAS, District Collector
Medchal-Malkajgiri District, Keesara
Mandal, Keesara.

... Respondent

This court made the following



ORDER:

On 27.12.2013, this Court passed the following interim order in W.P.M.P.No.47597 of 2013 in W.P.No.38285 of 2013:

“The petitioner made a representation dated 28.10.2013 to the 2nd respondent ventilating his grievance on the orders passed imposing restrictions for development of the property owned by the petitioner. However, the said representation is not disposed of so far.

Pending disposal of the writ petition, the 2nd respondent is directed to consider the representation dated 28.10.2013 and pass appropriate orders as warranted by law and communicate the decision within four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

When the matter was taken up, the proceedings of the Collector, Ranga Reddy District were produced before the Court, which was in response to the representation submitted by the petitioner on 28.10.2013. In view of the said proceedings, C.C.No.1173 of 2014 was closed.

The present Contempt Case is filed alleging violation of the directions issued by this Court extracted above.

In spite of specifically asking, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to point out any subsequent developments and violation of the directions of this Court subsequent to the closing of C.C.No.1173 of 2014. As noticed from the order passed by this Court, the direction was to consider the representation and pass appropriate orders and communicate the decision. For reasons mentioned in the memo dated 29.03.2015, the petitioner was informed of the inability of the District Collector to grant any order in his favour, as sought for in the representation. There is no further decision taken, which is in violation of the directions issued, warranting initiation of fresh contempt proceedings on the same issue which was earlier considered and closed. No case is made out for interference.

Leaving it open to the petitioner to workout his remedies as available in law, this Contempt Case is closed.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions if any pending stand closed.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

June 27, 2017
MRR