

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.436 OF 2019

DATED :24.04.2019

Between :

Smt. Arutla Swaroopa Rani

..

Petitioner

And

Sri T.Vijay Kumar, Commissioner & Director of
School Education, Opp.Telephone Bhavan,
Saifabad,
Hyderabad.

..

Respondent



This court made the following :

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.436 OF 2019

ORDER :

Heard.

2. This Court disposed of W.P.No.25967 of 2018 on 08.08.2018. Operative portion of the order in the said Writ Petition would show that the Commissioner and Director of School Education was directed to pass orders on the appeal preferred by the petitioner on 09.07.2018.

3. On 25.10.2018, the Director passed orders rejecting the request of the petitioner.

4. This Contempt Case is filed alleging that the orders of this Court are not complied. Therefore, the respondent violated the directions of the Court and hence liable for proceedings under Contempt of Court Act, 1971 (for short, 'the Act').

5. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, while disposing of another Writ Petition in W.P.No.25968 of 2018, similar direction was issued. After the disposal of the said Writ Petition, the petitioner therein preferred a representation. On due consideration of the representation, relief was granted on 29.01.2018, passing favourable orders. Whereas, in the case of the petitioner herein, though he also made a representation after the disposal of the Writ Petition i.e., W.P.No.25967 of 2018, the representation was not considered.

6. Whether the respondent is justified in not granting relief to the petitioner, as claimed by her, and whether the respondent

erred in not considering subsequent representations, made by the petitioner, is not within the purview of the contempt proceedings. This Court in the Writ Petition directed consideration of the appeal preferred by the petitioner on 09.07.2018, but has not expressed any opinion on merits and has not given any directions to consider in a particular manner.

7. That being so, the rejection of the request of the petitioner does not amount to violation of the directions issued, following initiation of proceedings under the Act.

8. Accordingly, the contempt case is closed, leaving open to the petitioner to work out the remedies available under law. No costs.

9. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand closed.

24th April, 2019
vnb

P.NAVEEN RAO, J