



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

[3331]

**TUESDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 538/2025

Between:

1.NAMAADI SUJATHA, W/O. SURESH KUMAR, AGED 43 YEARS, OCC WORKING AS SANITATION WORKER IN CHC-T.KOTHAPALLI, DR. B.R AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT, R/O D. NO. 1- 99, ADVIPETA, T. KOTHAPALLI, I. POLAVARAM MANDAL, DR. B.R AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT(WRIT PETITIONER-3)

...PETITIONER

AND

1.DR MAHESH KUMAR RAVIRALA IAS DISMISSED, .A.S., THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, DR. B.R AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT, AMALAPRUAM (W.P.NO.R3). R1 IS DISMISSED AS NOT PRESSED AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 01 05 2025 VIDE I A NO 2 OF 2025 IN CC NO 538 OF 2025

2.SMT DR JYOTHIRMAYEE, SUPERINTENDENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE(CHC) OF T.KOTHAPALLI, POLAVARAM, DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT. R 2 IS IMPLEADED AS SUO MOTO AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 14.11.2025, IN CC NO-538 OF 2025.

3.DR N DIYANA DISMISSED, THE SUPERINTENDENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE (CHC) OF T. KOTHAPALLI, I. POLAVARAM, DR. B.R AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT(W.P.NO.R5). R3 IS DISMISSED AS NOT PRESSED AS

PER COURT ORDER DATED 01 05 2025 VIDE I A NO 2 OF 2025 IN CC NO 538 OF 2025

4.SRI DATLA SUBBA RAJU DISMISSED, HON'BLE MLA, MUMMIDIVARAM ASSEMBLY CONSTITUENCY, MUMMIDIVARAM, DR. B.R AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT(W.P.NO.R6). R4 IS DISMISSED AS NOT PRESSED AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 01 05 2025 VIDE I A NO 2 OF 2025 IN CC NO 538 OF 2025

5.THE TVT GROUP DISMISSED, REP BY T. VENKATESHWARLU, S/O AND AGE. NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER, R/O D. NO. 18-104, SHANTI NAGAR, MIRYALAGUDA, NALGONDA DISTRICT, TELANGANA STATE. (W.P.NO.R8). R5 IS DISMISSED AS NOT PRESSED AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 01 05 2025 VIDE I A NO 2 OF 2025 IN CC NO 538 OF 2025

...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 summon the respondents/Contemnors and punish him Sec.10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, for willfully deliberately and intentionally violating the Interim orders in I.A.No.1/2024 in W.P. No. 21576/2024 dated 27-09-2024 of this Honble Court and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

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 direct the respondents to implement the Interim orders in LA. No. 1/2024 in W.P. No. 21576/2024 dated 27-09-2024 by directing the all the respondents to take decision in accordance with Final Orders pending the above Contempt Petition and pass

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

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 dismiss/close the above C.C. against the 1st, 3rd to 5th respondents and pass

IA NO: 3 OF 2025

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 recall the Bailable warrant issued on 14-08-2025 against me i.e. 2nd respondent in CC.No. 538 of 2025 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.G SIMHADRI

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.G RAJU

2.

The Court made the following:

ORDER

The above contempt case is filed complaining violation of the order dated 27.09.2024 in I.A.No.1 of 2024 in W.P.No.21576 of 2024.

2. The petitioner along with 2 others filed the above writ petition to declare the action of the respondents 4 and 6 viz. the District Coordinator of Hospital Services and Datla Subba Raju, MLA, Mummidivaram Constituency in directing the petitioner orally not to attend the duties from 01.10.2024 onwards in the 5th respondent-Community Health Centre (CHC), T.Kothapalli, I.Polavaram Mandal, Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Konaseema District, as illegal and arbitrary.

3. An interim order was passed directing the 4th respondent, District Coordinator of Hospital Services, to continue the services of the petitioner as per the terms and conditions of their appointment/contract. While granting an interim order, it was observed that the 7th respondent, Security Services Agency, provided the services of the petitioner as the sanitation worker in CHC, T.Kothapalli village and the 6th respondent-MLA addressed

a letter dated 09.09.2024 to the 4th respondent to remove the petitioner and others and thereafter, the 4th respondent orally directed the petitioner and others not to attend the duties. In those facts and circumstances, this Court granted an interim order.

4. In the affidavit filed in support of the contempt case, it was pleaded that after the interim order, the petitioner was continued till 02.02.2025, and thereafter, the Superintendent of CHC, T.Kothapalli orally directed the petitioner not to attend the duties from 03.02.2025.

5. The above contempt case was filed on 20.02.2025.

6. Initially, the 2nd respondent Dr.K.Karthik Reddy, filed counter affidavit. It was contended, *inter alia*, that the petitioner was appointed on a contract basis by the security agency. The 2nd respondent-contemnor is not the competent authority to appoint the petitioner or disengage her services. The Superintendent, CHC, entered into an agreement with TVT Group to provide certain services to the hospital. The said agency provided different services to the hospital as per the agreement. In the Area Hospitals, 100-bedded 2 hospitals, for which the manpower of 18 Sanitation workers to each hospital; 50-bedded hospitals to which 9 sanitation workers to each hospital and 30-bedded hospitals to which 7 sanitation workers to each hospital, are being supplied by the agency. After the interim order, the petitioner was continued till the end of January, 2025. After receipt of notice in the contempt case, the 2nd respondent enquired about the petitioner, and the agency informed that the petitioner herself had absented due to her personal reasons. The petitioner absented for 10 days in November 2024 and 3 days in December 2024, without any prior intimation.

7. This Court, *suo moto*, impleaded Dr.T.Jyothirmayi, present Superintendent, CHC, T.Kothapalli as a respondent in the contempt case. A

reply affidavit was filed by Dr.T.Jyothirmayi. It was contended that she assumed as Superintendent on 04.09.2025. On verification of the records and upon examination of the information furnished by the agency, she came to know that the petitioner was appointed through the TVT group. The Superintendent of CHC entered into an agreement dated 01.06.2021 with TVT group for a period of 3 years, and the same expired on 31.05.2024. Subsequently, it was extended until the execution of the agreement with the new agency on 01.10.2025. The petitioner was appointed through the TVT Group. Due to the absence of the petitioner, the agency appointed R.Meenakshi in her place from February, 2025 onwards. Despite the request made by the deponent, the agency is not accepting the petitioner due to her irregular attendance.

8. A reply affidavit was filed by the petitioner denying the averments in the respective counter-affidavits.

9. Heard Sri G.Simhardi, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri G.Raju, learned counsel for the respondents.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the respondents reiterated the contentions as per the averments in the affidavit, counter affidavit and reply, respectively.

11. The writ petition filed by the petitioner, along with 2 others, is still pending. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent authorities violated the interim order, and the said violation is intentional. In the counter affidavit filed by the respondent, it was pleaded that the petitioner was continued till the end of January, 2025 and thereafter the agency terminated the petitioner, since the petitioner absented herself from attending the duties. In fact, the petitioner was engaged through TVT Group, and later, another agency started supplying manpower from 01.10.2025.

12. The main contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that at the behest of the local MLA, the petitioner was disengaged and hence, the respondent authorities violated the interim order. This Court is not persuaded by the said contention.

13. To punish the respondents under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, the act done by the respondents/ contemnors must be deliberate and intentional. In fact, as seen from the averments in the counter affidavit and reply, the petitioner was continued, till the end of January, 2025. The same was not denied by the petitioner. If the agency disengages the services of the petitioner due to her irregular attendance, the respondents cannot be held liable for the same. There is no contractual obligation between the petitioner and the respondents. In fact, more allegations are made against the local MLA, and there is no direction against the said MLA in the writ petition.

14. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any deliberate violation to punish the respondents.

15. Accordingly, the Contempt Case is Dismissed. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI