

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE NO.2292 OF 2016

DATED:29-03-2018

Between:

Gundavarapu Venkateshwarlu
and another

... Petitioners


And

Dr. M. Hari Jawaharlal
and others

... Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONERS: Mr. Bethi Venkateswarlu

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: G.P. for Revenue (AP)



THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER:

This contempt case is filed alleging wilful disobedience of order dt.01.12.2015 in W.P. No.38980 of 2015.

By the aforementioned order this Court while dismissing the writ petition directed the respondents to consider the representation that may be filed by the petitioners before taking a decision on allotment of additional franchises for running Mee-Seva Centres at Gudur Village.

In the counter affidavit filed by respondent No.1 it is stated that as per the guidelines of the Government in G.O. Ms. No.45, Information Technology & Communications (Infra) Department, dt.09.10.2012, the existing Rural Service Delivery Point and Rajeev Internet Village centres' operators should give their willingness to the Administrative Officers, e-seva of the concerned Districts to start their centres under Citizen Service Center (CSC) Scheme, and that though Mee Seva Centre of petitioner No.1 is not in operation for several years, he did not opt to come under the CSC scheme by making proper application and hence his e-seva center is deemed to have been cancelled. That with a view to fill up the gap, after considering the eligible persons, one Sri U. Hari Prasad has been permitted to run the centre under CSC scheme with limited operations and that the Mee Seva Centre of petitioner No.2 has

been continuing in the same manner. It is further stated that after dismissal of the present writ petition, petitioner No.1 has also filed W.P. No.7281 of 2016, which was disposed of by this Court on 08.03.2016 directing respondent No.1 to consider the representations of petitioner No.1 dt.24.8.2015 and 14.12.2015 and take appropriate action thereon in accordance with law. As directed by this Court, respondent No.1 has issued notice to petitioner No.1 informing him to attend the enquiry in the former's office, and though he attended the enquiry he did not produce any other additional material except requesting for activation of his Mee Seva Centre. After considering the case of petitioner No.1 in detail, by order dt.16.09.2016 respondent No.1 has rejected the request of petitioner No.1 and therefore the respondents have not violated the orders of this Court.

In the light of the above averments in the counter affidavit, I do not find any merit in this contempt case and the same is accordingly dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the contempt case, Contempt Application No.1072 of 2016 shall stand disposed of as infructuous.

C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

29-03-2018

bnr

