



WEB COPY



1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01.10.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BATTU DEVANAND

Cont.P.No.2085 of 2024

in

WP No.15594 of 2018

M.Murthy

... Petitioner

VS

1.Dr.R.Brindha Devi, I.A.S.,
The District Collector/Inspector of Panchayats,
Salem District,
Salem.

2.Mr.Ravichandran,
The Personal Assistant to District Collector,
Development,
Salem District,
Salem.

3.Mr.Manickavasagam,
The Block Development Officer,
Village Panchayat,
Mecheri Panchayat Union,
Mecheri-636 453,
Salem District.

...Respondents

Contempt Petition filed Under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, pleased to punish the respondents under Section 11 of the



Contempt of Courts Act for having violated the order passed in WP No.15594 of 2018 dated 05.09.2023.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.R.Jothimanian
For Respondents : Mr.J.Ravindran, AAG assisted by
Ms.V.Yamunadevi, Spl.GP

ORDER

This Contempt Petition has been filed to punish the respondents for having violated the order passed in WP No.15594 of 2018 dated 05.09.2023.

2.This Court, while disposing of the said Writ Petition, directed the first respondent to examine the possibility of transferring the petitioner to a far away place/unsensitive post, within a period of sixteen weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

3.The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents would submit that in compliance of the order of this Court, vide proceedings dated 15.03.2024, the first respondent passed an order stating that the petitioner is under suspension from 10.08.2017, in view of the criminal case pending against him and therefore, his grievance for



reinstatement is rejected. The learned Additional Advocate General further submits that as the reinstatement was rejected, the question of consideration of of transferring the petitioner to a far away place/unsensitive post, does not arise and accordingly, he prays to dismiss the contempt petition.

4.Having heard the submissions of the respective learned counsels, this Court is of the considered opinion that in view of the order passed by the first respondent, wherein, the reinstatement of the petitioner was rejected and hence, the question of consideration of transferring the petitioner to a far away place/unsensitive post does not arise.

5.In the light of the above, there is no contempt of Court on the part of the respondents. Accordingly, this Contempt Petition is dismissed.

6.However, it is open to the petitioner to challenge the order of the first respondent in the appropriate forum in accordance with law, if he is so advised.

01.10.2024

dn



WEB COPY



4

BATTU DEVANAND.J

dn

To

1.Dr.R.Brindha Devi, I.A.S.,
The District Collector/Inspector of Panchayats,
Salem District,
Salem.

2.Mr.Ravichandran,
The Personal Assistant to District Collector,
Development,
Salem District,
Salem.

3.Mr.Manickavasagam,
The Block Development Officer,
Village Panchayat,
Mecheri Panchayat Union,
Mecheri-636 453,
Salem District.

Cont.P.No.2085 of 2024

01.10.2024