IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF OCTOBER

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY AND THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE LAXMI NARAYANA ALISHETTY

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 78 OF 2025

Contempt Case under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act 1971 to punish the respondent herein for violation and willful disobedience of the order dt. 03-09-2024 in W.A.No. 597 of 2016.

Between:

Capt. George A.E Paul, S/o. VDF Paul Aged about 56 Years. R/o.Tirumalagiri, Secunderabad.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. Commodore Madhava Rao, Bharath Dynamics Limited, Bhanur Medak District Rep by its Chairman and Managing Director
2. Sri L. Kishan, General Manager/ Executive Director (Unit Head), Bharath Dynamics Limited Bhanur, Medak District.
3. Biplab Sinha, Deputy General Manager/ Additional General Manager (P and A) Bharath Dynamics Limited, Bhanur, Medak

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner : Sri Thalluri Niranjan Prasad

Counsel for the Respondents : Ms. V. Uma Devi

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE LAXMI NARAYANA ALISHETTY

CONTEMPT CASE No.78 of 2025

(CNR No. HBHC010005212025)

Dated:28.10.2026

Between:

Capt. George A.E.Paul

...Petitioner

and

Commondore Madhava Rao
and 2 others.

...Respondents

ORDER: *(Per the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice P.Sam Koshy)*

Learned counsel Sri Thalluri Niranjan Prasad appears for the petitioner.

Learned counsel Ms. V.Uma Devi appears for the respondents through video conferencing.

2. The present contempt case is one which has been filed alleging wilful non-compliance of the order dated 03.09.2024 passed in W.A.No.597 of 2016.

3. It would be relevant at this juncture to refer to the operative portion of the order passed in the writ appeal, which reads as under:

> "8. Accordingly, the Writ Appeal is allowed by setting aside the order dated 11.04.2016 passed in W.P.No.6753 of 2000 by the learned Single Judge and also the punishment imposed by the 3rd respondent against the appellant *vide* proceedings dated 26.02.2000 and appellant is entitled to all the consequential benefits. No costs.
>
> Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed."

Non-compliance of this order led to filing of the present contempt case.

4. In the contempt case, the respondents/contemnors have come up with a counter affidavit. The respondents/contemnors have also filed a statement showing the comparison between the petitioner and similarly placed persons in the department in the course of showing due compliance of the order passed by this court. It has been brought to the notice of this court that an amount of Rs.4,41,146/-, which is an additional amount towards compliance of the order passed by this court, has been paid to the petitioner by way of a demand draft dated 28.04.2025. A copy of the said demand draft is produced before this court, which is taken on record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the calculation made by the department is erroneous and the comparison drawn also is not correct, as the petitioner being an Ex-Serviceman cannot be compared with a regular employee of the department.

6. All said and done, this court is seized of the contempt proceedings alleging non-compliance of the order to the extent of the punishment order of stoppage of two increments with cumulative effect being set aside. The nature of compliance which this court under the contempt jurisdiction can look into is whether the punishment order having been set aside, the petitioner has been granted the benefits of the two increments along with the consequential benefits. The department has done the calculation, which according to the petitioner is erroneous.

7. In the opinion of this court, all that this court as of now needs to look into is whether the order has been complied with or not and whether there is a wilful disobedience or non-compliance of the order. Having gone through the counter affidavit filed by the department and also the comparative statement submitted by the department, we are of the considered opinion that substantial compliance has, in fact, been made. Insofar as the contempt proceedings are concerned, substantial

compliance also is sufficient to drop the contempt proceedings. If at all there is any calculation error or a mistake committed by the department in the course of drawing comparison, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the department showing the actual way as to how the calculation ought to have been done and the respondents/contemnors shall duly consider the same and take appropriate decision immediately on the petitioner submitting the objections to the payments made and compliance shown by the department.

8. The contempt case, with the aforesaid liberty, stands closed. The respondents shall stand discharged from the contempt proceedings.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

SD/- A.V.S. PRASAD
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. One CC to Sri Thalluri N iranjan Prasad, Advocate (OPUC)
2. One CC to Ms. V. Uma Devi, Advocate (OPUC)
3. Two CD Copies

Mvj/GNK

pmc.

HIGH COURT

DATED: 28/10/2026

ORDER

CC.No. 78 of 2025



CLOSING THE CC

(S)PMG
31/10/26