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: 474 OF 2025

Contempt Case under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act 1971 to punish the respondent herein for their willful and deliberate disobedience of the order dt. 23-09-2024 in W.A.No. 702 of 2024.

Between:

R. Swarnalatha, D/o Late R. Venkat Narayana aged about 37 years, Unemployed R/o 1-4-249/A, Balaji Nagar, Suryapet, Suryapet District.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. Bhasker kareri, Chief General Manager (HRD) TGSPDCL Corporate Office 2nd floor, Mint Compound, Hyderabad
2. Musharraf Ali Faruqui, Chairman and Managing Director The Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Mint Compound, Hyderabad

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner : Sri M.V. Rama Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Sri G. Vidya Sagar, Senior Counsel representing Ms. K. Uday Sri

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDEABAD

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE LAXMI NARAYANA ALISHETTY

CONTEMPT CASE No.474 of 2025
(CNR No.HBHC010042442025)

DATE : 28.10.2026

Reserved on: 20.08.2026 **Pronounced on: 28.10.2026**
Uploaded on: 28.10.2026

Between

R.Swarnalatha **...Petitioner**

AND

Bhasker Kareri and another. **...Respondents**

ORDER:- *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Laxmi Narayana Alishetty)*

This contempt case is filed to punish the respondents under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, for willful and deliberate disobedience of the Order dated 23.09.2024, passed by this Court in W.A.No.702 of 2024.

2. Heard Sri M.V.Rama Rao, learned Counsel for the petitioner and Sri G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior Counsel representing Ms.K.Uday Sri, learned Standing Counsel for respondents.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner's father worked as Lineman in Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited (for short

'TGSPDCL') and he expired on 13.05.2013 leaving behind petitioner and her sister; that since the petitioner and her husband are unemployed, petitioner submitted a representation dated 12.07.2013 to TGSPDCL for appointment in a suitable post on compassionate grounds as she was solely dependent on her father, but the same was rejected by the respondents; that petitioner filed a writ petition *vide* W.P.No.14118 of 2014 and a learned Single Judge of this Court *vide* Order dated 08.09.2022, disposed of the same with a direction to TGSPDCL to reconsider the case of the petitioner for compassionate appointment; that the case of the petitioner was again rejected by TGSPDCL *vide* Order dated 28.10.2022 on the ground that petitioner was neither deserted by her husband nor her husband died.

3.1. He further submitted that petitioner filed one more writ petition *vide* W.P.No.9593 of 2023 and the same was dismissed *vide* Order dated 23.02.2024. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner preferred W.A.No.702 of 2024 and the same was disposed of by this Court *vide* Order dated 23.09.2024, with a direction to respondents to reconsider the case of petitioner herein by examining whether petitioner was totally dependent and was living with her deceased father at the time of his death and pass appropriate orders preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of Order.

3.2. He further submitted that respondents once again rejected the case of the petitioner *vide* proceedings dated 18.12.2024 on the same grounds, on which earlier representations were rejected, without following the directions issued by this Court in proper perspective and in true spirit. He further submitted that respondents have recalled the rejection Order dated 18.12.2024 *vide* proceedings dated 26.03.2025 and issued fresh rejection Order dated 28.05.2025. He further submitted that reasons assigned by the respondents in the earlier rejection orders that petitioner was married and she was not deserted by her husband was faulted with by this Court and directed the respondents to reconsider the request of the petitioner for compassionate appointment, however, respondents once again rejected the case of petitioner by merely referring to the Government Memo dated 08.10.2003. He further submitted that the grounds on which, the case of the petitioner was rejected were illegal and contrary to the directions issued by this Court. By contending thus, prayed to punish the respondents.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the respondents by referring to Counter submitted that in terms of Order dated 23.09.2024, passed by this Court, the case of the petitioner was reconsidered and the same was rejected *vide* Order dated

18.12.2024; that the said Order was recalled *vide* proceedings dated 26.03.2025 and fresh rejection Order dated 28.05.2025, was passed by recording detailed reasons. He further submitted that the case of the petitioner was examined thoroughly and as her case does not fall within the parameters and guidelines for compassionate appointment, the same was rejected.

4.1. He further submitted that the contention of the petitioner that her case was rejected on the same ground on which earlier representations were rejected is incorrect. He further submitted that this Court *vide* Order dated 23.09.2024, directed the respondents to examine the aspect whether the petitioner was solely dependent on her deceased father and whether she was living with her father at the time of his death. He further submitted that accordingly, respondents have examined the case of the petitioner in accordance with the directions issued by this Court and have passed a reasoned order dated 28.05.2025, and if the petitioner is aggrieved by the same, she has to challenge the rejection order dated 28.05.2025. He finally submitted that legality and correctness of an order passed in compliance of directions issued by this Court cannot be examined in contempt and that no further or supplementary orders can be passed in the contempt, therefore, contempt case is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has considered the submissions advanced on behalf of both the parties and perused the record.

6. In the present case, by order dated 23.09.2024 passed in W.A.No.702 of 2024, this Court directed the respondents to reconsider the case of the petitioner by examining whether the petitioner was totally dependent on her father and she was living with her deceased father at the time of his death and pass appropriate orders thereon in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of Order. The direction issued by this Court was to reconsider the representation of the petitioner and to pass appropriate orders within a specified period and it was not a direction to grant the relief sought for by the petitioner.

7. The material placed on record discloses that in compliance of Order passed by this Court, respondents have passed Order dated 18.12.2024, rejecting the case of the petitioner and the same was recalled *vide* proceedings dated 26.03.2025 and fresh rejection Order dated 28.05.2025 was passed. In the rejection Order dated 28.05.2025, detailed reasons for rejection have been recorded by the respondents by referring to Government Memo dated 08.10.2003 (adopted by the corporation on 20.03.2004) clarifying the policy of the Government to provide compassionate appointment to

dependents of deceased Government employees to help the family in distress. In the Government Memo dated 08.10.2003, it is clarified that once a marriage is performed, a daughter is not dependent even if she is an unemployee or her husband is an unemployee and a married daughter is said to be dependent on her parents when her husband deserts her or disappears for years together or dies. It was also clarified that the spouse of the deceased employee, pre-deceased her husband, therefore, the choice of one of the married daughters does not arise for consideration of the married daughter for employment on compassionate grounds. In the rejection Order it is also observed that mere living of the married daughter with the deceased employee at the time of death alone is not the criteria for consideration of employment on compassionate grounds.

8. It is pertinent to note that the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Lalith Mathur Vs. L.Maheswara Rao***[1], held that when the direction of the Court was to consider the employee's representation, and the said direction was complied with, be it, rejection of the same on merits, the employee has to assail the rejection order in a fresh Writ Petition; that Contempt Petition filed before the High Court is not maintainable and the High

[1] (2000) 10 SCC 285

Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the same and give relief on merits.

9. It is settled principle of law that contempt jurisdiction cannot be invoked for deciding the correctness or legality of an order passed in purported compliance with the directions of the Court. Once an order has been passed pursuant to the directions issued by the Court, the remedy of the aggrieved party lies elsewhere and not in contempt proceedings. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 28.05.2025 passed by the respondents, it is always open for her to challenge the same before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

10. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, in considered opinion of this Court, the petitioner has failed to establish any willful, deliberate or intentional disobedience of the order dated 23.09.2024 passed in W.A.No.702 of 2024. Therefore, no case is made out for initiating punitive action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

11. Accordingly, the contempt case is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

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

//TRUE COPY//

To **SECTION OFFICER**

1. One CC to Sri M.V. Rama Rao, Advocate (OPUC)
2. One CC to Sri G. Vidya Sagar, Advocate (OPUC)
3. One CC to Ms. K. Uday Sri, Advocate (OPUC)
4. Two CD Copies

Mvj/GNK
PMG.

HIGH COURT

DATED: 28/10/2026

ORDER

CC.No. 474 of 2025



CLOSING THE CC

6 PMG
31/10/26.