



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.400 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **24.02.2023**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

Cont.P.No.400 of 2023

K.Ramani

... Petitioner

versus

1.Tmt.Indira,
District Registrar (Administration)
O/o.The District Registrar North Chennai,
Kuralagam Main Building,
1st Floor, Broadway,
Chennai 600 108.

2.Dr.Kalpana,
District Registrar (Administration)
JVC Complex, (Uthokottai Road)
Near ICMR, Vedanginallur,
Thiruvallur

3.S.Sathishkumar

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed to punish the respondents for committing contempt of Court by wilfully disobeying the order of this Court dated 18.02.2022 in WP No.24907 of 2018.

For the Petitioner

: Mr.R.Prem Narayan

For the Respondents

: Mr.U.Baranidharan,
Additional Government Pleader,
for respondents 1 and 2



Cont.P.No.400 of 2023

ORDER

WEB COPY

The third respondent herein Mr. S. Sathishkumar, was the writ petitioner in W.P.No. 24907 of 2018.

2. The petitioner was the second respondent. That writ petition was filed questioning the enquiry notice dated 21.08.2018 issued by the first respondent, District Registrar (Administration) Chennai.

3. The learned Judge, who enquired into that particular writ petition observed that it was only an enquiry and therefore directed hearing of the enquiry and directed that notice should be issued to the petitioner therein and also to the third respondent herein.

4. A contempt petition has now been filed saying that no orders have been passed. However, the petitioner herein was the third respondent in the writ petition. On the one hand there was a writ petition questioning the enquiry notice and now a contempt petition is filed as to why the enquiry was not conducted pursuant to such notice.



Cont.P.No.400 of 2023

WEB COPY

5. It is informed by the learned Additional Government Pleader that even on 11.07.2022, a notice was issued and again on 21.02.2023 notice had been issued. Instructions have also been forwarded that the petitioner herein and another individual Durai Mudaliyar had not appeared for the enquiry. Only the third respondent Sathish Kumar alone appeared for the enquiry.

6. I do not find any reason to issue statutory notice or to keep the contempt petition pending. The contempt petition stands dismissed.

7. It is for the petitioner to attend the enquiry. Let the first respondent again issue a notice but, the onus is on the petitioner herein to attend the enquiry. He cannot avoid appearance before the enquiry and file a contempt petition herein.

8. There is no time limit granted. Let the respondent enquire in a proper manner depending on the nature of official work already pending with him.

24.02.2023

Index: Yes/no
mrn

3/4



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.400 of 2023

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
(mrn)

Cont.P.No.400 of 2023

24.02.2023