

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.02.2018

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

Contempt Petition No.1826 of 2016

Blessings International School,
Blessings Nagar,
Keerapakkam,
Thirukalukundram,
Tamil Nadu-603 109,
rep. by its Chairman,
E.Thomas Jayapaul,
S/o.Shri.M.Edward Nadar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Tmt.Sabita, I.A.S.,
Principal Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.Thiru.Kannappan,
Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Chennai-600 006.

... Respondents

WEB COPY

Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Court Act, to punish the respondents for willfully disobeying the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.6208 of 2016 dated 01.03.2016.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Sankaran

For Respondent : Mr.P.Rajalakshmi, AGP

ORDER

While disposing of the writ petition in W.P.No.6208 of 2016, by order dated 01.03.2016, this Court directed the 2nd respondent to consider the petitioner's application dated 31.10.2013 in the light of the particulars submitted by the petitioner to the Chief Educational Officer, Kanchipuram through their proposal dated 11.08.2014 and further proposal dated 31.12.2014 and to pass appropriate orders with regard to the grant of recognition and issuance of no objection certificate to the petitioner, on merits and in accordance with law.

2.The present contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the said order dated 01.03.2016 passed by this Court.

3.Today, when the matter is taken up for consideration, the learned Additional Government Pleader submitted that in compliance with the order of this Court, the 2nd respondent has considered the application of the petitioner and passed an order vide his proceedings in Na.Ka.No.1739/G1/E2/2016, dated 21.12.2017. He has also produced a copy of the proceedings issued by the 2nd respondent.

4.Since the order of this Court has been complied with, nothing

survives in this contempt petition and accordingly, the same is closed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the order passed by the 2nd respondent in the manner known to law, if he so desires.

ssv

09.02.2018



WEB COPY

R.SUBBIAH, J.,

SSV



Cont.P.No.1826 of 2016

09.02.2018

WEB COPY