



WEB COPY



Cont.P. No. 2143 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

Cont.P. No.2143 of 2025

K.M.Periyasamy

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.Tmt G.Laxmi Priya IAS.,
Secretary to Government,
Department of Adi Dravidar & Tribal Welfare,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.Thiru.T.Anand, IAS.,
The Director of Adi Dravidar & Tribal Welfare,
Chennai – 600 005.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Contempt petition filed under Section 11 of Contempt of Court Act, 1971, to punish the respondents for wilful disobedience of the order dated 30.10.2019 passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.No.17562 of 2015.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Karthikei Balan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Suresh Kumar
Additional Advocate General assisted by
Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan,
Special Government Pleader.



Cont.P. No. 2143 of 2023

ORDER

This contempt petition has been filed alleging violation of the order dated 30.10.2019 passed in W.P.No.17562 of 2015.

2. When the matter is taken up for consideration by this Court on 11.07.2025, it was brought to the notice of this Court by Mr.M.Suresh Kumar, learned Additional Advocate General representing Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan, learned Special Government Pleader, that the respondents have already complied with the order passed by this Court by issuing proceedings dated 02.12.2022, and the necessary benefits have been extended to the petitioner. However, the contempt petition has been filed without disclosing the factum of issuance of proceedings bearing RC.No.G1/2398/2020, dated 02.12.2022. Hence, the matter was adjourned to enable the learned counsel for the petitioner to get instructions.

3. Today, when the matter is taken up for consideration, it is admitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the petitioner who is physically present before this Court about the issuance of the proceedings dated 02.12.2022, and the benefits that were extended to the petitioner. However, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the



WEB COPY

petitioner is entitled for promotion from the date anterior than the date already assigned for promotion. In the considered view of this Court, the same cannot be gone into, as this Court has not passed any positive direction to extend the benefit of promotion from the particular date, but only directed the respondents to extend the benefit of promotion from the date on which the petitioner is entitled to. In view of the same, it cannot be said that the respondents have, in any way, deliberately violated the orders passed by this Court. In case, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the proceedings dated 02.12.2022, it is open for the petitioner to take appropriate steps to question the said order in accordance with law. Accordingly, the contempt petition is dismissed.

4. At this stage, it is brought to the notice of this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner that the benefits that are due and payable to the petitioner were not extended to the petitioner, in terms of the proceedings dated 02.12.2022.

5. On the other hand, Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan, learned Special Government Pleader submitted that the petitioner has to submit the pension proposal in terms of the proceedings dated 02.12.2022 and in case, if the same



Cont.P. No. 2143 of 2023

is submitted by the petitioner, the respondents would release all the benefits together with arrears within a period of three (3) weeks from the date of submission of the proposal. In view of the same, the petitioner is granted liberty to submit proposals in terms of the proceedings dated 02.12.2022 within a period of one week, and on submission of such proposal, the respondents shall release all the benefits within a further period of three (3) weeks.

18.07.2025

dpa

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No



WEB COPY



Cont.P. No. 2143 of 2025

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR ,J.

dpa

Cont.P. No. 2143 of 2025

18.07.2025