



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.835 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 25.04.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

Cont.P.No.835 of 2024

G.Muralidharan

... Petitioner

Vs

Parveen Kumar Thind,
The Director,
Dr.Ambedkar Foundation,
Ground Floor,
Narcotics Control Bureau Building
West Block-Wing No.VII
R.K.Puram, New Delhi-110 066.

.... Respondent

PRAYER: Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish the respondent for having committed willful contempt by disobeying the order of this Court made in W.P.No.29774 of 2023 dated 15.11.2023.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.T.Varadarajulu

For Respondent : Mr.V.Ashok Kumar



Cont.P.No.835 of 2024

Central Government Counsel

WEB COPY

ORDER

Heard Mr.S.T.Varadarajulu, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.V.Ashok Kumar, learned Central Government Standing Counsel for the respondent.

2. Vide order dated 15.11.2023, this Court had issued mandamus to the Director, Dr.Ambedkar Foundation/R2 to pass orders on the application of the petitioner for financial aid under Dr.Ambedkar Foundation Scheme for intercaste marriage.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that documents have been provided on 07.02.2024 and learned counsel for the respondent has produced a copy of order dated 01.03.2024 passed within a period of four weeks from the date of production of document, in compliance of the direction under order dated 15.11.2023.

4. Order dated 01.03.2024 is adverse to the petitioner on the ground that the application for financial aid has been submitted in the office of respondent only on 27.09.2019, which is beyond the period of one year of the marriage that took place on 14.07.2017.

5. To be noted that, the scheme requires that the couple should make an application for financial aid within one year from date of their marriage. It is



Cont.P.No.835 of 2024

the case of the petitioner that the date of receipt noted under order dated 01.03.2024, as 27.09.2019 is the date on which the District Collector had forwarded the petitioner's application to the respondent.

6. That may well be so. However, when asked for proof in regard to the date of submission of the application before the District Collector, no document is produced. Hence, this Court is unable to proceed further in regard to the merit or otherwise of the matter. Hence, and seeing as an order has been passed by the respondent on 01.03.2024, it would be appropriate that the petitioner challenge that order, if so aggrieved.

7. Recording the aforesaid and granting such liberty to the petitioner, this Contempt Petition is closed. No costs.

25.04.2024

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order
Neutral citations: Yes
sl



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.835 of 2024

Dr.ANITA SUMANTH,J.

Sl

Cont.P.No.835 of 2024

25.04.2024