

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1266 OF 2019

Dated:07.02.2020

Between:

P.Vijaya Kumar, S/o. Chandramouli
and others

.. Petitioners

And

Sri Rajiv Trivedi, I.P.S.,
Principal Secretary, Home
Department, T.S. Secretariat,
Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents



This Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1266 OF 2019

ORDER:

By order dated 21.08.2018 in I.A.No.1 of 2018 in W.P.No.26486 of 2018, this Court granted interim direction, taking note of the fact that the panel was approved by the Director General of Police and as long as the approved panel is in force, promotions cannot be denied. The interim prayer sought was to consider the case of the petitioners for promotion as Inspectors of Police (Civil) in accordance with the Memorandum dated 29.12.2017. Alleging that the promotions are not granted to the petitioners, this contempt case is filed.

2. In the counter affidavit filed by Sri Promod Kumar, working as Inspector General of Police, CID, it is stated that the panel was drawn including 10% extra names in accordance with Rule 6(e) of the Telangana State and Subordinate Service Rules, 1996, which can be filled up in anticipation of any vacancy that would be arising. It is further asserted that five of the petitioners in the writ petition were promoted as per their turn, but as the remaining petitioners were shown at the bottom of the promotion panel and were included against 10% anticipated vacancies and as there were no additional vacancies available, they were not promoted.

3. The approved panel is enclosed from page No.10 of the counter affidavit. As fairly submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners, the names of the petitioners are included from serial No.157 and below. These names are coming within 10% additional names which are included in anticipation of vacancies that may

arise. It is asserted in the counter that there were no additional vacancies. Though learned counsel for the petitioners sought to contend that the contention of 10% anticipated vacancies is not true, as the entire panel was approved, the said contention has no merit. The proceedings approving the panel clearly stipulate that the approved panel includes 10% additional vacancies in anticipation of vacancies that may arise in future. Therefore, it cannot be said that there is violation of the directions issued warranting initiation of contempt proceedings.

4. In view of the same, the contempt case is closed.

Date:07.02.2020

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

