



We have heard the petitioner Mr. K. Alfred, who appeared in person.

He invited our attention to the order dated 29.11.2018 which was stated to have been violated by the alleged contemnors. The directions issued in the said order in para 28 on which the petitioner places reliance were to the following effect:

"28. The appellant in W.A. No.1441 of 2017/Party-in-person would also claim that the terminal and other attendant benefits due and payable to him have not been disbursed at all and the learned counsel for the Management would submit that whatever dues the Party-in-Person is legally entitled will be disbursed to him within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order."

Finally, while rejecting the writ appeals and confirming the order dated 24.07.2017 passed by the Single Judge of the High Court in Writ Petition Nos.18058, 18301 and 31205 of 2015, it was directed as under:

"30 In the result, these Writ Appeals are dismissed, confirming the order dated 24.07.2017 made in W.P. Nos.18058, 18301 and 31205 of 2015. No costs.

31. It is also brought to the knowledge of this Court by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant/Management that the sum of Rs.2 Lakhs as ordered by the Labour Court has already been paid to the writ petitioner/Party-in-person and the remaining sum of Rs.3,00,000/- has been deposited to the credit of W.A. Nos.1325 and 1326 of 2017 and it has been invested in a Term Deposit with the Indian Bank, Madras High Court Branch on 12.04.2018 and it will be maturing on 12.04.2019 and the maturity value would be Rs.3,19,980/-. In the light of the orders passed by this Court, the appellant in W.A. Nos.1325 and 1326 of 2017 shall surrender the Fixed Deposit Receipt to the Registrar General of this Court within a week from the date of Receipt of a copy of this order, after putting the writ petitioner/Party-in-person on notice and on receipt of such notice, the writ petitioner/Party-in-person shall submit a petition to the Registrar General of this Court for withdrawing the said amount."

There is no grievance regarding the operative directions given in para 31, but in the submission of the petitioner, the directions in para 28 were not complied with.

From the record it is clear that according to the respondents, nothing is due to the petitioner. In the circumstances, whether the petitioner is entitled to anything apart from what was dealt with in para 31, is a matter which needs to be established first.

The High Court was, therefore, right in making the observations in para 7 as quoted above.

In the circumstances, we therefore, do not find any reason to interfere. This Special Leave Petition is, therefore, dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MUKESH NASA)  
COURT MASTER

(PRADEEP KUMAR)  
BRANCH OFFICER