



Cont.P.No.3765 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.01.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

Cont.P.No.3765 of 2024

M.B.Shaik Fazlullah

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Thiru C.Vijayaraj Kumar, I.A.S
The Government of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Principal Secretary
Backward Classes/Most Backward Classes
and Minorities Welfare Department
Fort St.George, Chennai 9.

2.Thiru.Dr.C.Palani, I.A.S
The District Collector
Cum The Selection Committee
District Kazi Selection Committee
Collect rate Office
Villupuram District.

3.Thiru.D.Muruganandam
The District Backward Classes and
Minorities Welfare Officer
Villupuram District



Cont.P.No.3765 of 2024

Villupuram District 605 602.

...Respondents

Prayer : Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Court Act, 1971, to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the order of this Court dated 24.06.2024 passed in W.P.No.16351 of 2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ganesan

For Respondents : Mr.K.Surendran for R1 to R3
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This Contempt Petition is filed bringing to the notice of this Court about the non compliance of the order made in W.P.No.16351 of 2024. In the said order, this Court recorded the undertaking furnished on behalf of the respondents that they have received totally 9 applications and they will be considering the said applications for appointment as Kazi under the Kazi Act. After recording the same in paragraph No.5, the respondents were directed to proceed with the exercise and constitute the selection committee and consider the applications as expeditiously as possible in any event not later than four months. Complaining that the same is not complied with, this Contempt Petition is filed.



Cont.P.No.3765 of 2024

WEB COPY

2. When the matter came up for hearing today, the learned Additional Government Pleader would produce an order dated 24.09.2024. In the said the order, the respondents have taken a view that since the appointment of an earlier Kazi is only without mentioning a time period, there is no need to make any fresh appointment and therefore, they have rejected all the applications including the applications of the petitioner.

3. Mr.P.Ganesan, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that for the neighbouring districts, it is only considered to be an appointment for three years and for Villupuram District alone, the Government is taking a different view. That may be so, all the contentions of the petitioner with reference to the grievance about the order dated 24.09.2024 are kept open. It is for the petitioner to challenge the order even if according to him is erroneously passed in the manner known to law. When the direction was given to consider and the respondents have taken a decision, nothing further remains to be decided in the Contempt Petition.



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.3765 of 2024

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

dna

4. Accordingly, this Contempt Petition is closed.

03.01.2025

Neutral Citation : No
dna

Cont.P.No.3765 of 2024