

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

CONTEMPT CASE NO.2053 OF 2014

ORDER:

Neither is Sri Sannidhiraja Malleswara Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner, present, nor is there any representation on his behalf. The order, violation of which is alleged in the present Contempt Case, is the order passed by this Court in WP.No.11201 of 2014 dated 21.04.2014 whereby respondents 2 to 4 (the Commissioner, GHMC and other officials of the GHMC) were directed to consider the petitioner's representation to grant building permission in accordance with law; pass orders thereupon; and communicate the same to the petitioner at the earliest, and in any event not later than one month from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

In the affidavit filed in support of the Contempt Case dated 16.11.2014, it is stated that no action was taken pursuant to the petitioner's representation on 14.07.2014; and the respondents have wilfully and deliberately violated the order of this Court.

In the counter affidavit, filed by the Deputy Commissioner, L.B.Nagar Circle, GHMC, it is stated that, in compliance with the order passed by this Court, orders were passed on the petitioner's representation on 01.09.2014 informing him that I.A.No.49 of 2012 in O.S.No.39 of 2012 (in which an interim order was passed) was pending on the file of the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District in respect of an extent of Ac.1.04 gts in Survey No.125/A; and after the outcome of the said order, action would be taken in accordance with law.

Sri Sampath Prabhakar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel, would draw my attention to the endorsement dated 28.06.2014 wherein a reference is made to the order passed by the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District in the said I.A. It is stated that the petitioner's application for building permission could not be favourably considered in the light of the stay order passed by the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District.

While the order of this Court does appear to have been complied with, there is a delay in its compliance. As an apology has been tendered for the delay, I see no reason to proceed against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

The Contempt Case is, accordingly, closed. Miscellaneous applications, if any, pending shall stand closed.



(**RAMESH RANGANATHAN, J**)

3rd August 2018
RRB