

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE: C.A.No.8 of 2025

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
3.	27.02.2026	<u>PSK,J & SCR,J</u> Counsel for the petitioner : Mr.P.V.Krishnaiah Counsel for respondent No.3 : Ms. M.Shalini, learned Government Pleader for Services-II <u>Rev.I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> Heard on I.A.No.2026, which is an application seeking review of the order dated 17.12.2025 passed in C.A.No.8 of 2025. The main ground of challenge in the present review petition is the fact that as a consequence of dismissal of the contempt appeal, the interim directions given by the Writ Court as a consequence get vacated, which was not the very purpose the contempt petition was filed at the first instance or the contempt appeal subsequently and as such the order passed in contempt appeal needs to be reviewed. Upon perusal of the pleadings, more particularly the operative part of the order of the learned Single Bench at the first instance in W.P.No.65 of 2025, it was noticed that the directions	Transferred to i/o folder, before corrections, if any.

	against the non-compliance of which the contempt petition has been filed was to pay regular salary to the writ petitioner. However, at the end of the direction, the Writ Court had made an observation that of the regular salary be paid <i>“if she is otherwise eligible”</i>. This fact was taken note of by the Contempt Court at the first instance and the Contempt Court had closed it taking note of the fact that the respondents after due consideration had passed an order holding that the writ petitioner was not found eligible. The same aspect was again duly considered by this Bench in the course of deciding the contempt appeal and we found that there was an element of discretion in the interim direction itself by the Writ Court, when the interim order was passed on 17.03.2025. If the discretion that was left with the respondents was exercised and the claim was rejected, the decision of the Contempt Court could not be found fault with, was the view taken by the Division Bench in the contempt appeal. We are of the considered opinion that if at all if the writ petitioner was not satisfied with the view taken by this Bench or the consequential outcome of the contempt appeal being that of the interim order granted by the Writ Court getting vacated, are not grounds which would fall within the purview of	
--	---	--

		review as is envisaged under Order XLVII Rule I of CPC. The contention of the applicant in the review petition would have to be treated as the order of this Bench to be an erroneous order or contrary to law. In either of the case, again it will not be review petition which could be the scope for remedy available for the writ petitioner, was for this Bench to re-consider the decision taken on merits. It is not the case where the ground raised by the writ petitioner was not considered in the appeal in the course of deciding the contempt appeal. For the aforesaid reasons, we do not find any scope for entertaining the review petition. The review petition is accordingly rejected. PSK,J SCR,J <i>Lrkm</i>	
--	--	---	--