

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA CIRCUIT BENCH  
AT GULBARGA

DATED THIS THE 15<sup>th</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2010

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUBHASH B.ADI

CCC NO.3043 OF 2010 (civil) ✓

corrected vide  
chamber order  
dt- 16/1/2012

BETWEEN:

M/s. NAAZ AGENCIES THROUGH  
ITS PROPRIETOR KAUSAR BEGUM  
W/O SYED OSMAN PASHA  
AGE: 40 YEARS  
R/O H.NO.11-1041/131/B  
NEAR ELAHI MASJID, M.S.K.MILL  
JEELANABAD, GULBARGA

... COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI.KRUPA SAGAR PATIL, ADV. FOR SRI.ASHOK PATIL,  
ADV.)

AND:

SRI.B.S.CHRESTOPHER  
AGE: 50 YEARS  
OCC: DIVISIONAL RAILWAY MANAGER  
(COMMERCIAL), SECUNDERABAD  
DIVISION, SOUTH CENTRAL RAILWAY  
SECUNDERABAD

(SRI.MANVENDRA REDDY, ADV.)  
---

...RESPONDENT ✓

Accused.

corrected vide  
chamber order  
dt- 16/1/12 ✓

This CCC is filed under Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Court Act praying to initiate contempt proceedings against the respondent herein and to punish him in accordance with law for having disobeyed the order dated 30.11.09 passed by learned Single Judge of this Court in WP No.81835/09.

This CCC coming on for orders today, **Mr.N.KUMAR, J.** made the following:

**ORDER**

This petition is filed complaining the disobedience of order passed by this Court on 30.11.2009 in WP No.81835/2010. In the said order, the respondent was directed to facilitate the signing of the agreement and the issuance of the work order. The respondents, after service of notice, have entered appearance and have filed their statement of objections contending that they are willing to permit the petitioner to sign the agreement and issue the work order. That was the stand, which they have taken even on the original side while deciding the writ petition.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that, the period of contract should be three years and not two years. The

said dispute is not decided in the writ petition. There is no mention about the said controversy in the writ petition. Therefore, the learned Single Judge who passed the order, has observed that if they still have any differences, they can agitate their claim and counter claim before the appropriate forums.

3. In that view of the matter, when the respondents are willing to permit the complainant to sign the agreement and issue him a work order, this petition for contempt is misconceived. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

Sd/-  
JUDGE

Sd/-  
JUDGE