

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED **04.01.2021**

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN**

Cont.P.No.1034 of 2020

R.Ravi,
No.61/2, Dasa Naickyanoor,
Alathur Post,
Kavunthapadi,
Erode 638 455.

...Petitioner

Vs

1. A.Sathanai Kural,
Senior Regional Manager,
Tamil Nadu State marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Coimbatore.

2. Tmt.V.Manimozhi,
District Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Erode.

... Respondents

Prayer: Contempt petition is filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, pleased to initiate contempt proceedings against the respondents for the wilful disobedience and not implementing the directions with letter and spirit of the directions issued by this Court in W.P.No.29376 of 2019, dated 17.10.2019.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Bharathy

For Respondents : Mr.K.Sathish Kumar,
Standing counsel for Tasmac

ORDER

The contempt petition has been filed against the respondents to punish them for their wilful disobedience of the order of this Court dated 17.10.2019, W.P.No.29376 of 2019.

2. Mr.A.Sathanai Kural, Senior Regional Manager, Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd., Coimbatore and the District Manager, Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd., Erode is appeared through virtual hearing.

3. This Court, by an order dated 17.10.2019 in W.P.No.29376 of 2019, directed the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 26.09.2018 and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law.

4. It is stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that as per the order of this Court, the 2nd respondent conducted an enquiry and passed order on 27.01.2020 by which the petitioner was posted in an another shop instead of the shop, which he requested in his representation, dated 26.09.2018. According to the petitioner, after relieving the petitioner from the post and posting him in a different place, some other person has been

accommodated in his place, especially when there was a specific direction issued by this Court that the petitioner should be placed in the same shop, from where he was divested of his duties.

5. This Court is not inclined to accept the contention of the petitioner with regard to placement of the petitioner in the very same shop, as there was no such specific direction in the order dated 17.10.2019. Since the request of the petitioner has been considered on 27.01.2020, thereby complying with the orders of this Court, the Contempt Petition is closed. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the order, it is open to him to challenge the order of the respondent dated 27.01.2020 in accordance with law. The Contemnors are discharged from the contempt proceedings. No costs.

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/29/03/2021