

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

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.AMARNATH GOUD

WRIT PETITION Nos.40084, 40130 and 40145 of 2018

09.11.2018

Between:

M/s.Aditya Construction Company India Pvt. Ltd.,
represented by its Executive Director, Hyderabad

..Petitioner

and

M.Srinivas and others

..Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: Mr.K.Venu Madhav

Counsel for respondent No.3 in W.P.No.40084 of 2018
and respondent No.2 in W.P.Nos.40130 and 40145 of 2018:
Assistant Government Pleader for Civil Supplies (T.S.)

Counsel for other respondents: --

The Court made the following:



COMMON ORDER: (Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

These writ petitions are filed feeling aggrieved by issue of warrants of arrest for securing the presence of the petitioner.

2. We have heard Mr.K.Venu Madhav, learned counsel for the petitioner, and perused the record.

3. Admittedly, the orders passed by the Telangana State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission at Hyderabad - respondent No.3 in W.P.No.40084 of 2018 and respondent No.2 in W.P.Nos.40130 and 40145 of 2018, (for short 'respondent No.3 Commission') have attained finality with the dismissal of the appeals by the National Commission. Therefore, the liability of the petitioner is undisputed. Even on the petitioner's own showing, substantial parts of the payments due under the orders of respondent No.3 Commission are still payable to the private respondents. In these facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that respondent No.3 Commission is justified in issuing impugned warrants of arrest. When a competent *forum* passes a lawful order in exercise of its jurisdiction, it is

not desirable for the High Court to interfere with such orders merely because it has power and discretion to do so. The orders passed by the subordinate *fora* deserve due respect so long as they conform to law and do not suffer from any arbitrariness or impropriety.

4. In the above view of the matter, we are not inclined to interfere with the orders of respondent No.3 Commission. However, as the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that his client is willing to pay the balance dues if reasonable time is granted, the petitioner is permitted to file an appropriate application before respondent No.3 Commission. If such an application is filed, respondent No.3 Commission will exercise its discretion in a fair and reasonable manner in considering the request of the petitioner for granting reasonable time for payment of the balance dues.

5. Subject to the above, these Writ Petitions are dismissed.

6. As a sequel to dismissal of these Writ Petitions, respective I.A.No.1 of 2018 filed by the petitioner in these writ petitions for interim reliefs stand dismissed as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

T.AMARNATH GOUD, J

09th November, 2018
GHN

