

**THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

**TUESDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY THREE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. BHASKAR REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1026 OF 2014

Contempt Case under Section 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act to punish the Respondent herein for willfully violating, the order of the High Court dated 23.1.2014, in WP.No. 26766 of 2013.

Between:

M/s. Sky-Tech Consultancy, Rep. by its Managing Partner M. Thirupathi Reddy, S/o M. Ramchandra Reddy, Aged:48 years, Occ: Private Civil Engineer(consultancy), R/o. H.No. 18-97/F-7, 15t floor, Rajinigandha Apartments, Chaitanyapuri, Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad-60

...PETITIONER

AND

Mr. K. Gangaram, S/o Not known to the Petitioner, Commissioner of Nirmal Municipality, Adilabad District.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioners: SRI ASHOK GOUD PONNAM

**Counsel for the Respondents: STANDING COUNSEL FOR NIRMAL
MUNICIPALITY, TELANGANA**

The Court made the following: ORDER


THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.BHASKAR REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE No.1026 of 2014

ORDER:

The contempt case is filed for alleged violation of orders of this Court in W.P.No.26766 of 2013 dated 23.01.2014.

Vide above said order, this Court was pleased to grant fifteen days time to the petitioner to draw up a detailed representation and submit the same to the respective local body, bringing out clearly as to how much money is due and payable on each count. It was also directed that the petitioner shall also set out as to how much money has been received by them so far and the same must be given credit to while making demand for payment of the balance outstanding amount. The concerned local bodies were directed to decide the said representation within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of representation addressing the issue and to communicate its order in response thereto. Further, it was observed in the said order that if the local body realises that any money is genuinely payable to the petitioner and the same is kept pending, the same may also be released within a period of 30 days. Alleging non-implementation of the said order by the respondent herein, the present contempt case is filed in the year 2014.



This Court on 11.07.2014 issued notice to the respondents, but cognizance has not been taken under Section 17 of the Contempt of Court Act, 1971. It is brought to the notice of this Court that since the contempt case is pending all these years, respondent has not considered the representation submitted by the petitioner stating that after the disposal of the contempt case, the grievance of the petitioner will be addressed by the respondent.

Therefore, this Court without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and maintainability of the same, considers it appropriate to close the contempt case, as no further orders are necessary, directing the respondent to comply with the order dated 23.01.2014 in W.P.No.26766 of 2013. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner, if any cause survives in the contempt case, to make appropriate application for revival of contempt case.

The contempt case is accordingly closed.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

SD/- T.KRISHNA KUMAR
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,


1. One CC to M/S Ashok Goud Ponnamp, Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CC to STANDING COUNSEL FOR SANGAREDDY MUNICIPALITY SANGAREDDY, MEDAK DISTRICT [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies

EDS

BSR

HIGH COURT

DATED:31/01/2023



ORDER

CC.No.1026 of 2014

CONTEMPT CASE IS ACCORDINGLY CLOSED.

5
14/03/23
BSR