



WEB COPY



Contempt Petition No. 2912 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C. SARAVANAN

Contempt Petition No. 2912 of 2023

R. Nirmala

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Sunil Paliwal, I.A.S.,
Chairman of Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai – 600 001.

2.Indranil Hazra,
Secretary of Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai – 600 001.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, to punish the respondents for willfully disobeying the order made in W.P. No. 25793 of 2017 dated 16.08.2021.

For Petitioner : Mr. K. Raja

For Respondents : Mr. AR.L. Sundaresan,
Additional Solicitor General
for Mr. R. Karthikeyan,
Standing Counsel

ORDER

Heard Mr.K.Raja, learned counsel for the Petitioner and
Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, learned Additional Solicitor General for the
Respondents.

1/4



2. The case of the Petitioner is that although the order dated 16.08.2021 of this Court in W.P.No.25793 of 2017 has been complied by the respondents, it is contended that such compliance is only partial. In this connection, the learned counsel for the Petitioner has stated in the additional affidavit filed in this Contempt Petition as follows:

“10. With regard to the contentions raised in Para 4 of the additional affidavit, it is submitted that the petitioner in W.P.No.25793 of 2017 has prayed for compassionate appointment and salary referring to K.Rajeshwari, Nagammal, M.R.Vijaya, Papammal, Vishalakshi, Kuppammal, Sumathi and Janaki, who were working along with the Petitioner in the Chennai Dock Employees Co-operative Canteen Ltd., with the monthly salary of not less than Rs.30,000/-. But, in the Additional Affidavit, the Petitioner is claiming for salary benefit referring to Tmt.Vasantha, which is totally new contention requested in the Additional affidavit which was not addressed in the original writ petition. Hence the request of the petitioner for the salary benefit on par with Tmt.Vasantha, is not within the scope of the Hon’ble Madras High Court order dated 12/08/2021 in W.P.No.25793 of 2017.”

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Additional Solicitor General for the Respondents and taking note of the jurisdiction of the Contempt Court, the relief sought for by the Petitioner during the course of hearing in this Contempt Petition cannot be granted, even if the Petitioner has made out a case for punishing the Respondents for Contempt of Court.



Contempt Petition No. 2912 of 2023

4. At best, the Petitioner can be relegated to work out appropriate remedy in the manner known to law, as there has been substantial compliance by the respondents with the order dated 16.08.2021 of this Court in W.P. No. 25793 of 2017.

5. It is therefore, open to the Petitioner to work out the remedy, although it may cause some inconvenience to the Petitioner, considering the fact that the scope of contempt is limited.

6. Accordingly, the Contempt Petition stands closed. No costs.

30.01.2026

AT
Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order

To
1.Sunil Paliwal, I.A.S.,
Chairman of Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai – 600 001.

2.Indranil Hazra,
Secretary of Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai – 600 001.



WEB COPY



Contempt Petition No. 2912 of 2023

C. SARAVANAN,J.

AT

Contempt Petition No.2912 of 2023

30.01.2026