

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.2244 OF 2018

Dated:25.01.2019

Between:

M.K. Laxmipathi, S/o. M.S.K. Navanetham,
Aged 55 years, Occ: Transport Constable,
O/o. Regional Transport Officer/District
Transport Officer, Medchal, Medchal
District, Telangana State and another .. Petitioners

And

Sri Sunil Sharma, IAS, Transport
Commissioner I/C, Government of
Telangana, Khairatabad, Hyderabad,
Telangana State .. Respondent

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**CONTEMPT CASE No.2244 OF 2018****ORDER:**

On 01.03.2017, this Court passed interim order in W.P.M.P.No.8364 of 2017 in W.P.No.6821 of 2017 granting liberty to the petitioners to make representations to the Transport Commissioner, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad, the respondent herein, pointing out anomaly and on submission of such representations, the respondent, was directed to consider the same and if what was contended by the petitioners was true, appropriate remedial steps should be taken.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that for the last eight years, the annual increments were not paid to the petitioners. He further submits that on 08.03.2017, petitioners made a representation requesting to release their annual increments.

3. Learned Government Pleader for Transport produced a copy of the proceedings dated 28.04.2017, whereunder the annual increments were released to the petitioners w.e.f. 01.11.2009 and there was no direction to release or to fix the annual increments in a particular manner.

4. Since there was no specific direction to release or fix the annual increments in a particular manner and only liberty was granted to the petitioners to make representations and if representations are made, the respondent was directed to pass orders thereon, it cannot be said that the respondent has violated

the directions issued by this Court, much less willful warranting initiation of contempt proceedings.

5. The Contempt Case is accordingly closed. If the petitioners are not satisfied with the amount of increments sanctioned to them, they are at liberty to work out appropriate remedies as available in law.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:25.01.2019

KH