

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2015

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N. K. PATIL

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RATHNAKALA

CCC NO.272 OF 2015 (CIVIL)

BETWEEN:

DR.K.VENKATESH
S/O LATE K.RAMACHANDRA RAO
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
EX-DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
CRPF, IRLA NO.2529, NO.6, 'D' MAIN,
EAST END, 9TH BLOCK, JAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU – 69.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI RAJAGOPALA NAIDU, ADV.)

AND:

1. THE UNION OF INDIA
NEW DELHI,
REPRESENTED BY ITS UNDER SECRETARY
MR.L.C.GOYAL, MAJOR BY AGE,
HOME SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS,
NORTH BLOCK,
NEW DELHI – 110 001.

2. MR.PRAKASH MISHRA
MAJOR BY AGE, DIRECTOR GENERAL, CRPF,
CGO COMPLEX,
NEW DELHI – 110 003.

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI C.V.PRAHALADA RAO FOR
SRI Y.HARIPRASAD, ADV. FOR A2;
A1 - DELETED V/O DTD:05/06/2015)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF
THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, PRAYING TO
INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE
SECOND ACCUSED FOR VIOLATING THE DIRECTIONS OF
THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.P.NO.962/2012 (GM-RES) DATED
19.01.2015.

THIS CCC COMING ON FOR ORDERS THIS DAY,
N.K.PATIL J., MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

This contempt petition is filed by the complainant seeking to
initiate action against the second accused for willful disobedience
of the order dated 19.01.2015, passed in W.P.No.962/2012 (GM-
RES) vide Annexure 'H'.

2. We have heard the learned Counsel for the complainant
and the learned Central Government Standing Counsel for the
accused.

3. Sri Y. Hariprasad, learned Central Government Standing Counsel appearing for accused has filed a memo dated 06.08.2015, along with Office Order No.I.X-54/1990.Ops.3 dated 04.06.2015 and submitted that the order dated 19.01.2015 passed in W.P.No.962/2012 has been complied with and the same has been communicated to the complainant. Therefore, he requests that the contempt petition may be dropped in the interest of justice and equity.

4. Per contra, learned Counsel for the complainant submitted that the order has not been fully complied with. The Order is passed in the month of June 2015 and the directions issued by this Court in W.P.No.962/2012 has not been strictly complied with. Further, he submitted that the contempt petition may be dropped reserving liberty to the complainant to question the correctness of the Office Order dated 04.06.2015.

5. The memo is placed on record. In the light of the submissions of both the parties as stated supra, the contempt

petition stands disposed of, reserving liberty to the complainant to question the correctness of the Office Order dated 04.06.2015 bearing No. No.IX-54/1990.Ops.3, if so advised or need arises. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Sd/-
JUDGE

nvj