



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.383 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.02.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

Contempt Petition No.383 of 2025

High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

... Petitioner

Versus

Tmt.S.kavitha,
Settlement Tahsildar,
Pallavaram.
Office Address:
Taluk Office Campus,
2nd Floor, Kanniyamman Koil Street,
Kurinji Nagar, Pallavaram,
Chennai 600 043.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Suo Motu Contempt Proceedings initiated against the Contemnor
herein as per the order of the High Court dated 20.01.2025 made in WA
No.3524 of 2024 and CMP No.27285 of 2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.Umesh Rao
Standing counsel



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.383 of 2025

For Respondent: Mr.Ramanlal, Additional Govt. Pleader
Assisted by Mr.Vadivelu Deenadayalan, AGP

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.)

The Contemnors has filed an affidavit, wherein it is stated that she chose to verify the genuineness of the Assignment Patta on the basis of the communication from the Divisional Engineer, Highways Department. But a copy of that communication has not been produced before us. We are sure that this affidavit is again an attempt to explain the misconduct. However, taking a lenient view, we close this Contempt, with a warning that any repetition of such mistakes will be dealt with very firmly and no leniency could be expected by the contemnors.

2. In the grounds of Writ Appeal in WA. No.3524 of 2024, ground No.10 reads as follows:

“10. The learned Judge was carried away by the contention made on behalf of the Writ Petitioners that the subject land were once upon a time assigned to their father late Ramaswamy, but however the so called assignment proceedings



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.383 of 2025

referred to by the Writ Petitioners were found to be 'not genuine' as evident, as evident from the certificate of the Tahsildar, Tambaram Taluk, Chengalpet District dated 02.11.2023."

and the said grounds have been signed by a very responsible officer, viz. the State Government Pleader. We find the language extracted above apart from being intemperate is highly disrespectful and misleading. Now that we have dismissed the Writ Appeal, we are taking a very lenient view despite being aware of the fact that the Officers of the Government as well as the officers of the State Government Pleaders Office do not treat this Court with respect that it deserves.

3. On the language used in paragraph 10 of the grounds of Appeal, we draw the attention of the learned Advocate General to such language and request him to issue suitable instructions to the State Government Pleaders, Special Government Pleaders, Additional Government Pleaders, Government Advocates and others, who are engaged by them or the officials concerned to draft grounds of Appeals, and affidavits not to use such intemperate language in the affidavits and grounds of Appeal.



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.383 of 2025

4. The Contempt Petition is disposed of with the above observation.

(R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.) (G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.)
17.02.2025

jv

Note: The Registry is directed to circulate the copy of this order to the learned Advocate General.

Index: No
Speaking order
Neutral Citation: No

R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.
and
G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.383 of 2025

jv

Contempt Petition No.383 of 2025

17.02.2025