



Cont. P. No.1266 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25.04.2023

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. VAIDYANATHAN

Cont. Petition No.1266 of 2022

Ramakrishnan

Petitioner

v

1 Thiru. Anbu Abraham
Managing Director
Metropolitan Transport Corporation (Chennai) Ltd.
Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

2 Tmt. Baama
Administrator
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation
Pension Fund Trust
Thiruvalluvar House
Pallavan Salai, Chennai 600 002

Respondents

Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, seeking to punish the respondents for wilful disobedience of the order dated 08.02.2021 passed in W.P. No.2612 of 2021.

For petitioner	Mr. D. Veerasekharan
For respondents	Mr. Ramanlaal assisted by Mr. C.S.K. Sathish

- - - - -



Cont. P. No.1266 of 2022

WEB COPY

ORDER

This contempt petition has been preferred seeking to punish the respondents for the alleged noncompliance of the order dated 08.02.2021 passed by this Court in W.P. No.2612 of 2021.

2 Today, when this matter was taken up for hearing, Mr.Ramanlaal, learned Additional Advocate General, produced before this Court, the replies sent by the Metropolitan Transport Corporation (Chennai) Ltd. and Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Employees Pension Fund Trust dated 28.01.2023 and 05.01.2023, respectively, and submitted that the aforesaid order of this Court has been duly complied with.

3 However, it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner's earlier service has not been reckoned by the respondents while calculating the terminal benefits.

4 To be noted, this Court cannot go into the aforesaid contention, inasmuch as, the prayer in the writ petition was that the petitioner's



Cont. P. No.1266 of 2022

representation dated 06.03.2020 may be directed to be considered and orders passed. Concededly, the petitioner's representation dated 06.03.202 has been considered and orders passed. In fact, certain benefits have been extended to the petitioner and certain benefits have been turned down by the respondents. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the replies adverted to in paragraph 2, *supra*, it is open to him to assail the correctness of the same in the manner known to law and filing a contempt petition cannot a remedy therefor to arm-twist the employer to settle his terminal benefits.

In the result, this contempt petition stands closed.

25.04.2023

cad



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.1266 of 2022

S. VAIDYANATHAN, J.

cad

Contempt Petition No.1266 of 2022

25.04.2023