

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: **22.11.2018**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR

CONT.P.No.2444 of 2018

S.Williams,

.. Petitioner

Vs.

Thiru.Anbu Abraham,
Managing Director,
Metropolitan Transport Corporation (Chennai)Ltd,
Pallavan Salai,
Chennai - 600 002.

.. Respondent

This Contempt petition is filed under Section 11 of Contempt Court Act, 1971, to punish the respondent for willful disobedience of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.No.14650 of 2018 dated 14.06.2018 as per the Contempt of Court Act.

For Plaintiff : Mr.D. Veerasekaran

For Defendant : Ms.S.Rajani Ramadass
Standing Counsel

WEB COPY
ORDER

Mr. D.Veerasekaran, learned counsel on record for petitioner is before this Court.

2. This contempt petition has been filed alleging

WP.No.14650 of 2018, relevant paragraphs are paragraphs 9 and 11 and the same read as follows:

'9. In the light of the narrative supra, there shall be a direction to respondent No.1 to dispose of the writ petitioner's aforesaid representation dated 23.05.2018, within six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

11. Respondent No.1 shall communicate a copy of order disposing of the representation to the writ petitioner within seven working days from the date of such disposal.'

3. Ms.S.Rajani Ramadass, standing counsel for Metropolitan Transport Corporation (Chennai) Limited, was before this Court and learned counsel represented the sole respondent in this contempt petition.

4. Be that as it may, Mr.D.Veerasekaran, learned counsel very fairly pointed out that he has disclosed in the contempt petition itself that the representation of the writ petitioner dated 23.05.2018 has been disposed of on 16.07.2018 by the respondent in the contempt petition, pursuant to the aforesaid order of this Court. It is also fairly submitted that it has been duly communicated to the petitioner in accordance with paragraph 11 of my order.

5. However, referring to the disposal of the representation vide proceedings dated 16.07.2018, learned counsel for petitioner pointed out that the respondent has not gone into the merits of the matter and has summarily disposed of the representation.

6. Considering that this is a contempt petition, the scope is very limited and it is deemed appropriate to leave it open to the petitioner to challenge the order of respondent by way of separate proceedings in a manner known to law.

7. As there is no dispute or disagreement regarding disposal of representation dated 23.05.2018 and communication of a copy of the order disposing the representation to the writ petitioner having been done within the time frames set out in the order in the writ petition, this contempt petition is closed.

SD/-

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR (COMM. CASES)

gpa/mp

//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.