

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO
CONTEMPT CASE (TR). No.262 AND 263 OF 2017

Dated:11.09.2018

CONTEMPT CASE (TR).No.262 OF 2017

Between:


Md. Sadat Rabbani, S/o. Md. Rahmath Ali,
Aged 28 years, Occ: Un-employee,
R/o.H.No.7-14-308, Khoj Colony,
Habibnagar, Nizamabad

.. Petitioner

And

Sri G.D. Priya Darsini,
Commissioner & Director,
Agriculture Department,
Telangana, Hyderabad and another

... Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE (TR). No.262 AND 263 OF 2017

COMMON ORDER:

O.A.Nos.2815 and 2829 of 2012 were disposed of by the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal (Tribunal), Hyderabad, on 18.12.2014 with the following directions:

“... For the reasons stated under Point No.(i), all the O.As. are disposed of with a liberty to the applicants to make fresh representations ventilating their grievances to the respondents herein and also State of Telangana, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and the respondents are directed to pass appropriate orders on their representations keeping in view the earlier policy decision taken in G.O.Ms.No.428, Education (IE2) Department, dt.23.09.1985, and its subsequent implementation in various Departments, except Agriculture, within a period of 15 days or before issuing notifications for filling up the posts of Agriculture Extension Officer Grade – II, whichever is earlier. C.A. and VMAs. Are closed.”

2. Alleging violation of the said directions, these Contempt Cases are filed.

3. Along with the Contempt Cases, petitioner enclosed a letter dated 06.06.2015 of the Agriculture and Cooperation (Agri.II) Department.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the said letter is not in compliance with the directions issued by the Tribunal and they are postponing the issue of taking a decision and no decision, as directed by the Tribunal, is taken.

5. A reading of the letter dated 06.06.2015, it is clear that having regard to the subsequent bifurcation of the State and other

parameters, the Government intended to frame new Service Rules with regard to the employees working in Agriculture Department and a decision would be taken with reference to Intermediate Vocational Crop Production Management Course for the post of Agricultural Extension Officer Grade – II at the time of finalization of the Service Rules. The issue was considered and appropriate response was given. Therefore, it cannot be said the respondents have violated the directions issued by the Tribunal warranting initiation of contempt proceedings against them.

6. The Contempt Cases (TR) are accordingly closed.

Date:11.09.2018

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

