



Cont.P.No.1835 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.07.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.DHANDAPANI**

Cont.P.No.1835 of 2024

S.Palani

...Petitioner

Vs.

Mohan
Managing Director,
State Express Transport Corporation Ltd.,
Pallavan Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

...Respondent

Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, seeking to punish the respondent for wilful disobedience of the order dated 10.07.2023 passed by this Court in W.P.No.14396 of 2016.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Premkumar

For Respondent : Mr.LSM.Hasan Fizal

ORDER

This Contempt Petition is filed seeking to punish the respondent for wilful disobedience of the order dated 10.07.2023 passed by this Court in W.P.No.14396 of 2016.



WEB COPY

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, this Court, vide order dated 10.07.2023 made in W.P.No.14396 of 2016, directed the respondent corporation to reinstate the petitioner with all benefits including continuity of service, except the back wages and in compliance of the same, though the petitioner was reinstated into service with effect from 28.10.2023, however, instead of fixing his basic pay on par with the other employees, his basic pay was fixed at Rs.17,700/- for the 1st month salary after reinstatement and Rs.19,300/- was fixed as basic pay for the 2nd month, which is a clear violation of the orders passed by this Court. Accordingly, he prayed for appropriate orders.

3. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that, prior to the termination, the petitioner suffered two punishment and thereby, his basic pay was not upgraded. Further, if at all the petitioner is aggrieved, the petitioner has to make appropriate representation before the respondent corporation for claiming the benefits and if such representation is made, the same will be considered by the respondent and appropriate orders will be passed.



Cont.P.No.1835 of 2024

4. In view of the stand of the petitioner that he has been reinstated and his pay has been fixed, this Court is of the view that, the order under contempt has been complied with and there is no wilful disobedience of the order of this Court and accordingly, this Contempt Petition stands **closed**. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the fixation of basic pay, it is open to the petitioner to work out his remedies in accordance with law.

05.07.2024

skt

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order : Yes/No

M.DHANDAPANI, J.



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.1835 of 2024

skt

Cont.P.No.1835 of 2024

05.07.2024