

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.02.2019

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Contempt Petition No.696 of 2017

R.Prakalathan ...Petitioner

Vs.

Mr.Pandy
Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation(Salem)Ltd.,
12, Ramakrishna Salai
Salem - 636 007

...Respondent

Prayer : Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, to punish the respondent herein for committing Contempt of Court for willfully disobeying the order of this Hon'ble Court dated 01.09.2016 and made in W.P.No.30420/2016.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Jeevanantham

For Respondent : M/s.Rajeni Ramadoss

WEB COPY
O R D E R

The present Contempt Petition is filed to punish the respondent for committing Contempt of Court for willfully disobeying the order of this Hon'ble Court dated 01.09.2016 made in W.P.No.30420/2016.

dated 01.09.2016 has not fully complied with. The calculation memo submitted by the petitioner was not considered by the respondent and he has taken into account the less years of services as qualifying service for the purpose of calculating the pension and pensionary benefits.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is entitled to reckon more number of years of service as qualifying service for the purpose of calculating the pension and pensionary benefits. However, the said benefit has not been granted to the contempt petitioner. Thus, he is constrained to move the present contempt petition.

4.The issue to be considered in the present contempt petition, is the order of the Court says that "without going into the merits of the matter, the Managing Director and the General manager of the respective Transport Corporation are directed to disburse the aforementioned retiral benefits to the petitioners herein in twelve equal monthly instalments, in the light of the common judgment passed by this Court in W.A.(MD).Nos.383 to 457 of 2015."

5.As far as the said issue is concerned, this Court

never adjudicated the issues in relation to the reckoning of the qualifying service and the amount of Pension and

pensionary benefits to be paid to the contempt petitioner. Absolutely, there was no adjudication in respect of the quantum of amount to be paid to the contempt petitioner. Contrarily, a general direction was issued by this Court to settle the terminal and pensionary benefits due to the contempt petitioner with reference to the orders passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court. Thus, the calculations are to be carried out by the establishment of the respondent and it is not as if, the calculation memo submitted by the petitioner should be accepted as it is. Even, in case of any discrepancy, it is left open to the petitioner to approach the competent authorities for the purpose of redressing his grievances. Contrarily, the contempt petition cannot be entertained and the contempt jurisdiction, which is to be used sparingly, this Court is of an opinion that in respect of the disputes in relation to the calculation of pensionary benefits, no contempt petition would be entertained under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 in the absence of any specific order by this Court. Thus, it is left open to the petitioner to approach the competent authorities for the redressal of his grievances in respect of his pensionary benefits, by submitting separate representation.

6.With this liberty, the contempt petition stands closed. No costs.

SD/-
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR (COMM.CASES)
kak

//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.

PS/20/02/2019
To

The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Salem) Ltd.,
12, Ramakrishna Salai
Salem - 636 007

WEB COPY