



WEB COPY

Cont.P.No.254 of 2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.09.2021

CORAM :
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.A.NAKKIRAN

Cont. P.No.254 of 2016

K.Suseela,
25/5, Giriyappa Street,
T.Nagar, Chennai 600 017

... Petitioner

vs.

Mr.Chandra Mohan,
The Managing Director,
Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board,
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai – 600 002.

... Respondent

Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Court Act, pleaded to punish the respondent for Contempt of Court in wilfully and deliberately flouting and disobeying the orders passed by this Court in W.A.No.1607 of 2012, dated 13.10.2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sasindran, for
Mr.Achari and Antoni Association
For Respondent : Mr.N.Ramesh

ORDER

(Order of the Court delivered by S.VAIDYANATHAN,J.)

This Contempt Petition is filed for the alleged disobedience of the

Order of this Court, dated 13.10.2014 made in W.A.No.1607 of 2012.



2. The learned counsel for the respondent brought to the notice of this

Court to the finding of the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.1607 of 2012 to prove that there is no disobedience on the part of the respondent.

The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:

6. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant is unable to show any order extending family pension to the persons died prior to the issuance of the said G.O.Ms.No.546, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1986.

7. In such view of the matter, we are unable to interfere with the order of the learned single Judge and the Writ Appeal is dismissed, however, it is made clear that if the appellant is having any proof that any of the widow of a person, who retired or died prior to 30.04.1986 was given family pension, it is open to the appellant to approach the respondents to sanction of family pension.

3. On a perusal of the above finding of the Division bench, we could not find any specific direction which is said to have been disobeyed. Further, the contention that others who retired or died prior to 30.04.1986, have been granted pension, cannot be gone into in this Contempt Petition, since the scope of the Contempt Petition is very limited. Hence, this Court makes it very clear that the petitioner shall approach the respondent with regard to



Cont.P.No.254 of 2016

sanction of family pension with relevant documents, if she is eligible and it is open to the petitioner to workout her remedy in accordance with law.

4. With the above observation, this Contempt Petition stands closed.

SD/-
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR(COMM.CASES)

vum

//Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this the day of 2021.

COURT OFFICER(O.S.)
from 25th day of September 2008 the Registry is issuing Certified copies of
the Orders/Judgments/Decrees in this format.

GS/27/10/2021