



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

FRIDAY, THE 14th DAY OF AUGUST 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 755 OF 2025

Between:

1. PEETA VEERA RAGHAVIAH, S/o Koteswara Rao, Aged about 40 years,
Occ FP Shop Dealer, R/o D. No. 8-160, Chennai bodu gowda colony,
Brahmanapalli Village, Piduguralla Mandal, Guntur Now Palanadu District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. V MURALI KRISHNA, Revenue Divisional Officer, Gurazala Division,
Guntur Now Palanadu District.

2. Sri J Madhu Babu, Tahsildar, Piduguralla Mandal, Guntur Now Palanadu
District.

...Respondents

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 Respondent under Sections 10 to 12 of
the Contempt of Courts Act 1971 for wilfully, deliberately and violating the
Order dated 18.10.2024, granted by this Hon'ble Court in WP. No. 23341 of
2024 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

pleased to dispense with filling of certified copy of the Order dated 18.10.2024 in WP. No. 23341 of 2024 on the file of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati and receive the main contempt case pending disposal of the above contempt case and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: K SRINIVAS

Counsel for the Respondents:

The Court made the following

ORDER:

This Contempt Case is filed for willful violation of the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.23341 of 2024 on 18.10.2024, wherein this Court passed the following order:

“....In view of the same, this Court is of the opinion that so long as the authorization of the petitioner is not suspended or cancelled, supply of goods cannot be stopped and if at all the respondents have initiated any action as per law and suspended or cancelled the petitioner’s dealership, the petitioner is not entitled to continue the supply of essential goods. But, if any such act is not taken, the petitioner is entitled for supply of the essential goods, subject to compliance of legal formalities.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.”

2. Today when the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order dated 18.10.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.No.23341 of 2024 has been complied with by the respondents. Therefore, requested this Court to close the contempt case.

3. Recording the above submission, the Contempt Case is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA