



WEB COPY



Cont.P. No. 3100 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.10.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

Cont.P. No.3100 of 2024

V.Marimuthu

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.Thiru.D.Karthikeyan,
The Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration & Water Supplies Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.Thiru.Kiran Gurralla,
The Director of Town Panchayat,
MRC Nagar, Santhome High Road,
Chennai – 28.

3.Dr.R.Brindha Devi,
The District Collector,
Salem District,
Salem.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Contempt petition filed under Section 11 of Contempt of Court Act, 1971, to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the orders of the Hon'ble Court passed in W.P.No.21326 of 2003 dated 08.01.2013 under the provisions of Contempt of Courts Act.



WEB COPY



Cont.P. No. 3100 of 2024

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Elangovan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Neelakandan
Additional Advocate General assisted by
Mr.M.S.Prem Kumar
Government Advocate

ORDER

'Mr.Neelakandan, learned Additional Advocate General represented that the respondents have already complied with the order passed in W.P.No.21326 of 2003 as early as in the year 2015, and aggrieved by the order, dated 07.10.2015, the petitioner herein, also filed another writ petition vide W.P.No.34559 of 2015. The said writ petition was allowed by an order dated 12.07.2023 and the said order was also implemented by the respondents by issuing proceedings dated 21.05.2024. However, suppressing all these facts, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.

The learned counsel for the petitioner having received the typed set of papers filed by the respondents seeks time to verify from the petitioner. Hence, post the matter on 30.10.2024 under the caption 'for orders'. In case, if the contention of learned Additional Advocate General is found correct, the petitioner would be liable to pay exemplary costs.'



Cont.P. No. 3100 of 2024

2. After passing the above order, the learned counsel for the petitioner made a mention and sought permission of this Court to withdraw the contempt petition. The petitioner is also present before this Court in person. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that, due to some miscommunication, the present contempt petition has been filed, and as a matter of fact, there was no contempt, much less deliberate contempt of the order passed by this Court.

3. In the circumstances, this contempt petition is dismissed.

28.10.2024

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
dpa



WEB COPY



Cont.P. No. 3100 of 2024

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR ,J.

dpa

Cont.P. No. 3100 of 2024

28.10.2024