



Cont.P(MD)Nos.1906 to 1909 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 28.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

Cont.P(MD)Nos.1906 to 1909 of 2024
in WP(MD) Nos.28390 to 28392 of 2023

M.Tamilselvan

... Petitioner in Cont.P(MD) No.1906 of 2024

C.Mangalanatha Sethupathy

... Petitioner in Cont.P(MD) No.1907 of 2024

V.Rajakarunanithi

... Petitioner in Cont.P(MD) No.1908 of 2024

M.Monimozhian

... Petitioner in Cont.P(MD) No.1909 of 2024

Vs

Dr.N.Subbaian

The Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
170, E.V.R.Street, Keelpakkam,
Chennai.

... Respondent

Common Prayer: These Contempt Petitions filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, to punish the contemnors/1st respondent for the wilful disobedience and non-compliance of the order passed in WP(MD) No.28391 of 2023, dated 04.04.2024 for committing the act of contempt of Court.

For Petitioners : Mr. R.Saravanan

For Respondent : Mr.M.Ajmalkhan
Additional Advocate General



WEB COPY



Cont.P(MD)Nos.1906 to 1909 of 2024

Assisted by Mr.A.Oliraja
Government Advocate

COMMON ORDER

Alleging wilful disobedience of the order passed in W.P.(MD)Nos. 28390 to 28392 of 2023, these Contempt Petitions have been filed.

2.Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Additional Advocate General for the respondent submitted that the orders of this Court have been complied.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that once again the representations of the petitioners have been rejected and that no scheme has been formulated, as per the subsequent order passed by this Court in these proceedings, dated 02.07.2025.

4.As the respondent considered the representation of the petitioners on its own merits and if the petitioners are not satisfied with the outcome of the order, it is always open to them to challenge the same in the manner known to law.



Cont.P(MD)Nos.1906 to 1909 of 2024

5.Though it was suggested by this Court by its order, dated 02.07.2025 to form a scheme to safeguard the interest of the petitioners who have completed more than 10 years of service, the failure to form such a scheme cannot be construed considered as committing contempt of Court, since the order is suggestive in nature and not strictly directional. It is well settled that framing of a scheme is a matter of Government policy, and the role of the Court in such matters is limited. Since the representation of the petitioners have once again been rejected, as already noted, the petitioners can only challenge such orders, in the manner known to law.

6.With the above observations, these contempt petitions are closed.

28.08.2025

NCC :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Internet:yes/No
PNM

To
Dr.N.Subbaian
The Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
170, E.V.R.Street, Keelpakkam,
Chennai.



WEB COPY



Cont.P(MD)Nos.1906 to 1909 of 2024

Dr.R.N.MANJULA, J.

PNM

COMMON ORDER IN

Cont.P(MD)Nos.1906 to 1909 of 2024
in WP(MD) Nos.28390 to 28392 of 2023

28.08.2025