



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

[3329]

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 779/2026

Between:

1.VADLAMUDI SITAMAHALAKSHMI, W/O. VADLAMUDI
ACHYUTHARMAIAH, R/O 11-116, KSR THOTA, GAVARAVARAM,
ELURU - 534003.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.G SAI PRASAD IAS, PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT, A.P.
SECRETARIAT, AMARAVATHI CAPITAL CITY, VELAGAPUDI POST,
THULLUR MANDAL, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2.K VETRI SEVI I A S, DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ELURU, WEST
GODAVARI DISTRICT.

3.K SRINIVASA RAO, DISTRICT REGISTRAR, ELURU, WEST
GODAVARI DISTRICT.

4.LAVANYA, SUB REGISTRAR, ELURU DIVISION, WEST
GODAVARIDISTRICT.

5.K GAYATRI DEV, TAHSILDHAR, PEDAVEGI VILLAGE ELURU
MANDAL.

...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 willful disobedience of

the order of the Honble Court in W.P.No. 13734 of 2025, dated 30.06.2025 on the file of this Honble Court, under Section 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.MEDIKONDA PRANAY VENKAT CHOWDARY

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.K M KRISHNA REDDY

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA**CONTEMPT CASE NO: 779/2026****ORDER:**

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

2. The allegation of the petitioner in the present contempt petition is that even though this Court passed final order dated 30.06.2025 directing the respondents to consider and dispose of the representation dated 26.03.2025 submitted by the petitioner, within a period of four(4) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order, the respondents did not comply with the order of this Court. Hence, the contempt case.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that as directed by this Court, the respondents had considered the representation in all respects and discussed every aspect about the nature of land, claim and acquisition of the subject land by the petitioner from her vendor. After having detailed enquiry and investigation and by observing the same in a detailed manner, rejected the claim of the petitioner by holding that R.S.No.1102-2 is correlated to R.S.No.1150 which is classified as 'Sa Aa Pu' and the pattadar name was mentioned as left blank in the remarks column. The category of assignment to the political sufferers as claimed by the petitioner was not mentioned in the copy of D-patta. The applicant also not furnished any particulars that his vendor Chinnamuttaivi Chetu Madhavarao was recognized as a political sufferer, the assignment particulars as

stated are not recorded in the assignment register in the office of Tahsildar, Pedavegi. In view of the said factors, the claim of the petitioner was rejected.

4. Heard the learned counsel for both the parties and perused the material placed on record more particularly the written instructions dated 28.02.2026. For determination of the core issue before this Court whether the respondents committed any contempt pursuant to the orders of this Court or not, it is appropriate to extract the order of this Court dated 30.06.2025 hereunder:

“In the result, with the consent of both the learned counsel, the writ petition is disposed of, directing the respondents to consider and dispose of the representation dated 26.03.2025 submitted by the petitioner, after providing opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned, within a period of four (04) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.”

5. On perusal of the order of this Court, it is specific and clear that the respondents are directed to consider and dispose of the representation dated 26.03.2025 within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of the order. The copy of the order was received by the respondents, as per certified copy, on 31.07.2025. As directed, the respondents shall consider and dispose of the representation on or before 31.01.2026. Reasons best known to the respondents, they considered and disposed of the representation on 28.02.2026. As contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the impugned rejection order passed by the respondents is without application of mind and not considered in true spirit as directed by this Court is not valid and acceptable for

the reason that the order passed by the respondent dated 28.02.2026 is a detailed order with all reasons in every aspect and also with application of mind and also after having detailed enquiry and investigation. Further, the respondents also explained in a detailed manner how the petitioner is not entitled for her claim. In view of the consideration and disposal of the representation of the petitioner vide proceedings dated 28.02.2026, no further orders are necessary.

6. Accordingly, the Contempt Case is closed. No order as to costs.

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

VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA, J

21.04.2026

TPS

75

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

(closed)

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 779/2026

21.04.2026

TPS