

SUB.A.(MD). No.230 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

SUB.A.(MD). No.230 of 2024

in

CONT P(MD).No.1243 of 2023

in

W.P.(MD).No.3548 of 2023

S.Muppudathi

... Petitioner/Petitioner

Vs.

Moham,
The Manager,
Central Depot,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Tirunelveli Zone,
Tirunelveli District.


...Respondent/Respondent

Prayer: Sub Petition filed under Section 151 of Civil Procedure Code, to reopen the Contempt Petition in Cont.P.(MD).No.1243 of 2023 dated 02.02.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.George Stephen Kanikkairaj

ORDER


This petition has been filed to reopen the Contempt Petition in Cont.P.(MD).No. 1243 of 2023 dated 02.02.2024.



SUB.A.(MD). No.230 of 2024

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the wife of one V. Bharamanayagam, who is employed as a Ticket Inspector in the respondent-Corporation. Subsequently, a matrimonial dispute arose between the petitioner and her husband. Thereafter, the petitioner's husband initiated steps to remove the petitioner's name from the service records. Consequently, the petitioner submitted a representation to the respondent, requesting that the service and pension benefits of her husband not be disbursed without her consent. Following this, the petitioner filed a Writ Petition in W.P.(MD).No.3548 of 2023, and this Court, by order dated 22.02.2023, directed the respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 21.12.2022. However, the respondent failed to comply with the said order. Therefore, the petitioner filed a contempt petition in Cont.P.(MD).No. 1243 of 2023, which was closed by this Court vide order dated 02.02.2024, observing that the order passed in W.P.(MD).No.3548 of 2023 had been complied with.

3. The main contention of the petitioner is that, in the order dated 07.07.2023 passed by the contemnor, her request not to disburse the terminal benefits was not properly considered. This Court had only directed the respondent to consider the representation. Instead of challenging the order



SUB.A.(MD). No.230 of 2024

dated 07.07.2023 passed by the contemnor, the petitioner has filed the present

Sub Application. Hence, the same is not maintainable.

4. In the result, the Sub Application stands dismissed.

06.06.2025

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
TSG



WEB COPY



SUB.A.(MD). No.230 of 2024

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

TSG

SUB.A.(MD). No.230 of 2024
in
CONT P(MD).No.1243 of 2023

06.06.2025