IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF FEBRUARY TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL AND THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.SHRAVAN KUMAR

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 2741 OF 2023

Contempt Case under Section 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish the Respondents herein for their will full violation and deliberation disobedience of the orders of this Court dated 25/09/2023 passed in W.P.No. 21901 of 2023.

Between:

G. Naga Rani, W/o. V. Shankar Rao, Aged about 39 years, Occ. Govt., SC Girls Hostel, Zamistanpur, Hyderarbad, R/o H.No.11-9-75/1, Lakshmi Nagar colony, Kothapet, Hyderabad.

...Petitioner

AND

Shri Anudeep Durishetty, District Collector (SCDD) Hyderabad.

... Respondent

Counsel for the Petitioner :Sri K. Rajashekar

Counsel for the Respondent : GP FOR SERVICES V

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.SHRAVAN KUMAR

CONTEMPT CASE No.2741 of 2023

ORDER: *(Per Hon'ble The Acting Chief Justice)*

The complaint of the petitioner is that the order dated 25.09.2023 passed by this Court in W.P.No.21901 of 2023 has not been complied with.

2. This Court in the said order directed the District Collector to decide the representation of the petitioner for permanent transfer to the State of Telangana afresh in the light of law laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in **Dr. S. Shobha Rani v. State Reorganization Department**[1]. Thereafter, in furtherance of the stand of the learned counsel for the Government taken on 27.09.2024 that the matter will be re-examined, on 14.02.2025, the Principal Secretary to the Government by Memo No.1694/SCD.SER/2022-15 has examined the issue and reiterated its previous decision dated 14.11.2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner by placing reliance on the judgment in the case of **The Barium Chemicals Ltd. v. Sh.A.J.Rana**[2] and submitted that the consideration is faulty.

---

[1] 2017 (3) ALD 207 (DB)
[2] (1972) 1 SCC 240

4. In our considered opinion, the only direction issued in the order in W.P.No.21901 of 2023 was to consider the representation of the petitioner in the light of the judgment of this Court in **S. Shobha Rani** (supra). If the consideration is faulty or erroneous, the appropriate remedy for the petitioner is to challenge the rejection in appropriate fresh proceedings (see **V. Kanakarajan v. GM, S.E.Rly.**[3], **Anil Kumar Shahi v. Prof. Ram Sevak Yadav**[4] and **Manjula Choudhary v. Priyanka Chauhan**[5]).

5. In view of the aforesaid, nothing remains to be done in this Contempt Case and the same is **disposed of** while reserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the orders passed on her representation in appropriate proceedings. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous applications, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Sd/- K. SAILESHI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to Sri K. Rajashekar, Advocate [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to GP FOR SERVICES V, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
3. Two CD Copies

ADK/plp

[3] (1996)10 SCC 102
[4] (2008) 14 SCC 115
[5] (2015) 4 MPLJ 704 DB

HIGH COURT

DATED:21/02/2025



ORDER

CC.No.2741 of 2023

DISPOSING OF THE CONTEMPT CASE WITHOUT COSTS

(6)

kyn
7/4/25