

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.09.2018

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

Contempt Petition No.554 of 2018

A.Venkatesan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Thiru.K.Muthukaruppan,
Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Transport
Corporation (Villupuram) Limited,
Vazhuthareddy, Villupuram-605 602.

2.Thiru.G.Natarajan,
General Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport
Corporation (Villupuram) Limited.,
Thiruvannamalai Region,
Thiruvannamalai.

... Respondents

Contempt Petition has been filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Court Act, to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the order of this Court passed in W.P.Nos.34992 of 2016, dated 04.10.2016.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Sakthivel

For Respondents : Mr.K.Kulandaivelu
for Mr.A.Antony Arokiyaraj

ORDER

This Court, while disposing of the writ petition in W.P.No.34992 of 2016, by order dated 04.10.2016, directed the respondents to disburse the retiral benefits to the petitioner in twelve equal monthly instalments in the light

of the common judgment passed by this Court in W.A.(MD).Nos.383 to 457 of 2015 (K.Rajendran & others Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Madurai) Limited, rep. by its Managing Director, Madurai and others), dated 12.06.2015 and it was made clear that the first instalment shall commence from 01.01.2017.

2.The present contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging non-compliance of the order dated 04.10.2016 passed by this Court.

3.Today, when the matter is taken up for consideration, the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-Transport Corporation submitted that the order of this Court has been duly complied with and the entire retiral benefits with interest have been disbursed to the petitioner.

4.However, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is difference in payment of gratuity and Earned Leave encashment and the respondent-Corporation has to pay the said amounts.

5.Considering the submissions made on either side, this Court is of the opinion that pursuant to the directions of this Court, the respondent-corporation has

disbursed the retiral benefits to the petitioner. Hence, nothing survives for the adjudication in this contempt petition.

6. Accordingly, this contempt petition is closed. However, if the petitioner has any grievance with regard to disbursement of the retiral benefits, he is at liberty to make a representation before the respondents.

SD/-

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR (COMM. CASES)

ssv

//Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this the day of 2019.

COURT OFFICER (O.S.)

from 25th day of September 2008 the Registry is issuing Certified copies of the Orders/Judgments/Decrees in this format.

PS/19/11/2018

WEB COPY