



WEB COPY

CONT P No. 1232 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T. VINOD KUMAR

CONT P No. 1232 of 2026

M.Srinivasan

Petitioner

Vs

Maheshwari
The Sub Collector / District Manager,
TASMAC Limited, Kanchipuram.

Contemnor

PRAYER Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, seeking to issue summons to the Respondent for her wilful disobedience of the order made in WP.No.27004 of 2011 dated 18.03.2024 and punish the respondent.

For Petitioner: Mr.S.Kumaradevan

For Respondent Mr.L.S.M.Hasan Fizal,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This Contempt Application is filed to punish the respondent for her wilful disobedience of the order of this Court, dated 18.03.2024 in W.P.No.27004 of 2011.



2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondent and perused the records.

3. A co-ordinate bench of this Court while disposing of the aforesaid W.P.No.27004 of 2011, directed as under:-

“5.In this view of the matter, this petition is allowed and the impugned order is set aside and quashed with a liberty to the respondent to proceed against the petitioner in the manner known to law. Whatever proceedings, if any, initiated should be completed within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In view of the quashing of the impugned order, it is no doubt that the petitioner is entitled for reinstatement and other attendant benefits.”

4. Though on behalf of the petitioner, it is contended that despite this Court while quashing the impugned order, directed the respondent to reinstate the petitioner, the respondent did not comply with the order.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that despite the petitioner following up the matter with the respondent, the respondent kept the issue pending and as such, the petitioner was constrained to file the present contempt case on 02.03.2026.



6. I have taken note of the aforesaid submission made on behalf of the petitioner.

WEB COPY

7. At the outset, it is to be noted that Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 prescribes the limitation period of one year for initiating contempt proceedings.

8. This Court by order dated 01.06.2023 in Cont.P.Nos.2599 & 3033 of 2025 and Cont.P.No.2706 of 2025 had considered the scope of Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act and Article 215 of the Constitution of India, and also as to what would constitute continuing cause of action.

9. This Court having regard to the law declared by the Hon'ble Apex Court had held that Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act, being a specific provision, the contempt petitions have to be filed within one year when the cause of action arises.

10. In the facts of the present case, the cause of action for the petitioner to file a petition had arisen on expiry of three months time granted by this Court from the date of receipt of a copy of the order dated 18.03.2024. The petitioner not only did not take any action thereafter within time prescribed under the



Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, on the other hand had approached this Court by filing the present contempt case nearly two years later.

WEB COPY

11. Having regard to the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court and this Court, this Court is of the view, the present contempt petition cannot be entertained.

12. Accordingly, this Contempt Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

27-03-2026

vum

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

To

Maheshwari

The Sub Collector / District Manager,
TASMAC Limited, Kanchipuram.



WEB COPY

CONT P No. 1232 of 2026



T.VINOD KUMAR J.

vum

CONT P No. 1232 of 2026

27-03-2026