

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.3045 OF 2018

Date:26.04.2019

Between:


Y. Dayanandam, S/o. Late Sri Y. Yellaiah,
Age 49 years, JAO, O/o. AAO/ERO/Town/
TSNPDCL Hanamkonda and others

.. Petitioners

And

Sri A. Gopala Rao, Chairman and Managing
Director, the Telangana State Northern
Power Distribution Company Limited,
Corporate Office at Vidyuth Bhavan,
Nakkalagutta, Hanamkonda, Warangal
Urban District, rep., by its Chairman and
Managing Director Sri A. Gopal Roa and others

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**CONTEMPT CASE No.3045 OF 2018****ORDER:**

This Contempt Case is filed alleging violation of the directions issued by this Court in I.A.No.1 of 2018 in W.P.No.35973 of 2018. Seven I.As. were filed along with the writ petitions and the I.As. were considered by order dated 12.10.2018, wherein the following directions were issued.

“Having regard to these submissions, petitioners are granted liberty to make representations, if not already made, ventilating their grievances for retention at least for some time on personal grounds such as health of himself/herself or family members, education of children, disability of employee or dependent and place of work of spouse. If such representations are made within one week from the date of receipt of copy of this order, same shall be considered objectively and appropriate decision be made within two weeks thereafter including the possibility of accommodating such employees on deputation basis wherever the competent authority finds that the grievance ventilated requires such accommodation.”

2. Along with the counter affidavit, the order passed by the competent authority on 13.02.2019 is enclosed. On due consideration of the respective submissions for retention/treating on deputation, as directed by the Court, the request of the petitioners is rejected.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners sought to contend that the rejection is nothing but reiterating the earlier decision and the same is not valid.

4. Having regard to the directions issued by this Court, this Court cannot go into the merits of the reasons assigned for rejecting

the request of the petitioners and that can be considered in appropriate proceedings. Hence, I am of the opinion that there is no disobedience much less willful and deliberate, warranting interfering by this Court.

5. The Contempt Case is accordingly closed leaving it open to the petitioners to work out their remedies as available in law.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:26.04.2019
KH

