



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2182 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.02.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

Cont.P.No.2182 of 2024

Dr.Sridhara Suthan M

.. Petitioner

VS

1.Mr.Gagandeep Singh Bedi IAS,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Principal Secretary,
Health and Family Welfare Department,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.Dr.R.Illango Maheswaran
The Director of Medical and Rural Health Services,
Anna Salai, Chennai.

3.Dr.T.S.Selvavinayagam
The Directorate of Public Health and Preventive Medicine,
Anna Salai, Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 086.

4.Dr.J.Sangumani
Director of Medical Education,
Directorate of Medical Education,
Kilpauk, Chennai – 600 010.

5.Dr.E.Theranirajan
Dean of the Madras Medical College,
E.V.R.Periyar Salai,
Chennai – 600 003.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971
to punish the respondents for wilful disobedience of the order dated
26.02.2024 made in W.P.No. 4624 of 2024.

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Vidhusan



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2182 of 2024

For Respondents : Mr.E.Sundaram
Government Advocate

ORDER

The submission of Mr.E.Sundaram, learned Government Advocate, appearing for the State submits that a Review petition has been e-filed seeking review of order dated 26.02.2024 on the strength of an order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.Nos. 2796 & 2801 of 2024 dated 20.11.2024.

2. This Court had an occasion to consider similar circumstance in Cont.P.No.2604 of 2024 and by order dated 29.01.2025 stated as follows:-

"Mr.E.Sundaram, learned Government Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. The directions under order dated 20.03.2024 as against which the contempt has been alleged are to the effect that the covid duty performed by petitioners must be taken into account to construe the bond period.

3. The State had filed writ appeals in other similar matters and, vide order dated 20.11.2024, the Division Bench of this Court has held that covid duty cannot be taken into account to reckon the bond period.

4. Ms.Gayathri, learned counsel for petitioner states that a Review Petition has been filed as against the aforesaid order.

5. While the petitioners may well pursue the Review, this Court finds no reason to keep this contempt petition pending.

6. Recording the aforesaid narration of events, this contempt petition is closed. No costs. Connected Sub Application is closed."



Cont.P.No.2182 of 2024

3. In view of the identity of the legal position, this Contempt petition is also closed. No costs.

4. Be that as it may, learned counsel for petitioner would submit that, in fact, the petitioner is entitled to return of certificates even otherwise based on the delay in issuance of posting order as well as other factors.

5. Since these are questions of fact, liberty is granted to petitioner to make a representation before the authorities setting out the basis on which she seeks return of certificates. Upon receipt of such representation, if and when filed, orders will be passed expeditiously and within a period of six weeks from date of receipt of such representation and in accordance with law, bearing in mind the relevant Government Orders and orders passed by the Division Benches of this Court.

19.02.2025

Index:Yes
Neutral Citation:Yes
ssm



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2182 of 2024

DR. ANITA SUMANTH,J.

ssm

Cont.P.No.2182 of 2024

19.02.2025