



Cont.Petn.No.1441 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.08.2023

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. B.BALAJI

Cont. Petn. No.1441 of 2017

T.R.Mani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. C.K.Mishra - IAS,
Secretary to Government, Union of India,
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare,
Nirman Bhavan, New Delhi, 110 011.
2. Dr. Soumya Swaminathan, Director General,
Indian Council of Medical Research,
Ansari Nagar, New Delhi 110 029.
3. Dr.Aparup Das, Director, (Additional Charge),
Centre for Research in Medical Entomology,
No.9/4, Sarojini Street, Chinna Chokkikulam,
Madurai 625 002.

... Respondents

Prayer: Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of the Courts Act, 1971 to punish the respondents for disobedience of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.20898 of 2005 dated 11.07.2016.



Cont.Petn.No.1441 of 2017

For Petitioner : Mr.Senthil

For Respondents : Mr.ARL Sundaresan,
Additional Solicitor General
for Mr.P.Santhosh Kumar,
Standing Panel Counsel for R1
Mrs.G.Sudha for R2 and R3

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.)

The writ petitioner has filed the present contempt petition to punish the respondent for disobedience of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.20898 of 2005 dated 11.07.2016, setting aside the order of Tribunal dated 14.10.2004 in O.A.No.1041/2003 and also directing the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the application of the Scheme of IRAS to the petitioner, who is a technical staff of ICMR from 01.01.1995, within eight weeks.

2. The third respondent had filed counter affidavit stating that the order of the Writ Court has complied with and the revised pension arrears for the period from 01.01.2016 to 31.01.2018 has been paid to the petitioner on 31.01.2018, as a special case and further all the consequential benefits on



Cont.Petn.No.1441 of 2017

MBAPS scheme, which is nothing but IRAS on CSIR Pattern, from 01.01.1996 to 31.06.2017, has also been paid to him Further, if the petitioner contends that under the IRAS Scheme he would have more benefits and if he points out any difference, the same would be considered and to be paid the petitioner, as a special case.

3. Recording the above, this contempt petition is closed. Still, if the petitioner feels that there is some difference of amount to be settled to him, it is for him to approach the authorities concerned, seeking the difference amount.

(D.K.K.J.)

(P.B.B.J.)

10.08.2023

Internet: Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
mst



WEB COPY



Cont.Petn.No.1441 of 2017

D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.

and

P. B.BALAJI, J.

mst

Contempt Petn. No.1441 of 2017

10.08.2023