

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K. JAISWAL

CONTEMPT CASE NO.779 OF 2016

DATED:29-07-2016

Between:

P. Parameswar Reddy ... Petitioner

And

Mr. Manomohan Singh
and others

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER: Mr. P.V. Krishnaiah

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NOs.1 to 3 and
5 to 7: G.P. for Services (AP)

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.4 : G.P. for Services
(TS)

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.8 : Mr. B. Narayana Reddy,

Assistant Solicitor General

ORDER: *(per the Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy)*

This contempt case is filed alleging wilful disobedience of order dt.31.3.2016 in W.P.M.P. No.12197 of 2016 in W.P. No.9654 of 2016.

By the aforementioned order, this Court while following the interim order in an earlier case wherein a direction was issued to the respondents not to make final allocations in the cadre of Deputy Collectors without finalizing the inter se seniority list in the said cadre, issued an identical direction in respect of the allocations of the Deputy Superintendents of Police. The petitioner averred that in spite of the said order, the respondents have called for options vide Notification No.12731/SR1/A1/2015, dt.22.4.2016. We have carefully perused the said Notification wherein it is *inter alia* stated as under:

"The options called for from the employees of O/o. DGP is without prejudice to the orders of Hon'ble High Court in W.P.M.P. No.12197 of 2016 in W.P. 9654 of 2016."

In our opinion, there is no merit in the plea of the petitioner that mere calling of options constitutes violation of the order of this Court. It is not the pleaded case of the petitioner that any final allocations were made so far. The restraint order passed by this Court having been confined only to making of final allocations, it is implied therefrom that the respondents are free to take all other intermediary steps which will lead to final allocations. The very fact that a reference is made in the Notification itself shows that the respondents are very much conscious of the order passed by this Court and in the absence of any final allocation, it cannot be said that they have acted in any manner which constitutes violation of the order under contempt.

For the aforementioned reasons, we do not find any merit in this

contempt case and the same is accordingly dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the contempt case, Contempt Application Nos.448 and 649 of 2016 shall stand disposed of as infructuous.

C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

M.S.K. JAISWAL, J

29-07-2016

bnr