



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3329]

THURSDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 452/2026

Between:

1.P. BHASKAR REDDY, S/O. PADMANABIAH, AGED 34 YEARS, R/O.
D.NO.1-5J, KANTEEPURAM VILLAGE, 515 303 BULLASAMUDRAM
POST, MADAKASIRA MANDAL, SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.SRIDHAR REDDY, S/O NOT KNOWN, AGE NOT KNOWN. THE
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CONSTRUCTIONS), APSPDCL,
PUTTAPARTHI, SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

2.MR CHANDRA NAIK, S/O NOT KNOWN, AGE NOT KNOWN. THE
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (OPERATIONS), APSPDCL, HINDUPUR,
SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

3.MR M RAGHU, S/O NOT KNOWN, AGE NOT KNOWN. THE DEPUTY
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (OPERATIONS), APSPDCL, MADAKASIRA,
SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

...CONTEMNOR(S):

Petition under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act 1971 praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit file herein the High Court may be pleased to please to punish the respondents for intentionally and willfully violating the docket order Dt 24.02.2025 passed in W.P.No. 5014 of 2025, u/s 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to dispense with the filing of Certified Copy of docket order dated 24.02.2025 in W.P.NO. 5014 OF 2025 of this Hon'ble High Court, in filing the above Contempt Case othen/vise the petitioner will suffer irreparable loss and hardship and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.M CHINNAPA REDDY

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.VENKATA RAMA RAO KOTA SC FOR APSPDCL

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA**CONTEMPT CASE NO:452 OF 2026****ORDER:**

This contempt case is filed against the respondents for willful disobedience of the orders dated 24.02.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.No.5014 of 2025.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner filed the present contempt case under Sections 10 to 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the course of hearing the learned counsel for the respondents made a submission that the respondents are not taking any steps for laying of electrical poles at the petitioner's subject land as alleged by the petitioner. The said statement was made by the learned counsel for the respondents and was noted that as per the instructions of the respondents. Now, the respondents have violated their own submission made through counsel before this Court. Hence, the Contempt Case.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that as per the instructions obtained as on that day, he submitted the subject statement. He further submits that as per the instructions, the respondents are taking steps to lay electrical lines/poles within the road margin of R&B, but not at the petitioner's land. As per

their understanding and as per the information furnished by the R&B Department, today, learned counsel for the respondents also submitted fresh instructions dated 22.01.2026, wherein, it is stated that the laying of electrical poles is within the road margin of the R&B department only, but not through the land of the petitioner. He further submits that if the petitioner still aggrieved by the same, the petitioner can make an application for joint inspection, identification and demarcation of the property between the petitioner and the R&B Department. As long as the poles were already erected within the road margin of the R&B, the action of laying of electrical poles at the petitioners land does not arise.

6. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for both the parties, it is observed that the mere statement of the learned counsel for the respondents in the writ petition, during hearing of the matter cannot be construed as an order and it cannot be enforced under the provisions of the Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. It is further observed that the said docket order is not observed as an undertaking or an assurance given by the learned counsel on behalf of the respondents, but it is a formal statement made by the learned counsel for the respondents upon the instructions that the respondents are not taking any steps for laying of electrical lines through the petitioner's land. Even as per the instructions as produced/ furnished today dated 22.01.2026, it indicates that laying of electrical poles was happened within the road margin of R&B road but not within the land of the petitioner.

7. In view of the same, the alleged violation of the contempt case does not arise and the petitioner has not made out a contempt in pursuance of the docket order dated 24.02.2025 which was assailed in this contempt case.

8. Accordingly, the contempt case is dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in the contempt case shall stand closed.

VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA, J

12.02.2026

NOTE:C.C by two(2) days

(B/o)

BSP

18

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

(closed)

Contempt Case No.452 of 2026

12.02.2026

NOTE:C.C by two(2) days

(B/o)

BSP