



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

[3209]

**THURSDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

**PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA**

CONTEMPT CASE No.743 of 2021

Between:

Bombuthula Srinivas Yadav, S/o.Pitchaiah, Aged about 45 years,
Occ:Business R/o.H.No.11-194/1, Dachepalli Village and Mandal, Guntur
District, A.P.

... Petitioner

AND

1. Sri K Venkata Rao, Assistant Director of Mines and Geology Nadikudi
Village, Dachepalli Mandal Guntur District.
2. Sri G Levi, Tahsildar Dachepalli Mandal Guntur District.

... Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr.Ghanta Sridhar

**Counsel for the Respondents: Mr.K.Naveen Kumar
Mr.Syed Khader Mastan**

The Court made the following **ORDER**:

Heard Ms.Mahathi Saaveri, learned counsel representing Mr.Ghanta Sridhar, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr.K.Naveen Kumar, learned counsel for the respondent No.1 and Mr.Syed Khader Mastan, learned counsel for the respondent No.2.

2. The Contempt Case is filed alleging non-implementation of the order dated 21.1.2021 passed in Writ Petition No.13598 of 2020, the relevant portion of which reads as follows:

Be that as it may, since it is stated that the relevant information is already made available to respondent No.4, he shall take necessary action in the matter within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and in the event, if the petitioner is not entitled for issuance of any NOC, the reasons therefor shall be intimated to him by way of an order, so that he will workout his remedies.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner though sought to justify the filing of the Contempt Case against respondent No.1, who was arrayed as respondent No.3 in the writ petition, the order extracted above would go to show that the direction was issued to respondent No.3 i.e., the respondent No.2 in the present Contempt Case and as such the filing of the Contempt Case against the respondent No.1 is not tenable.

4. In so far as the respondent No.2 is concerned, a counter affidavit was filed along with a copy of the endorsement dated 06.3.2021. A reading of the said endorsement makes it clear that the request of the petitioner for granting No Objection Certificate (NOC) was rejected, for the reasons stated therein. In view of the same, the contention that the respondent No.2 had violated the orders of the Court, cannot be appreciated.

5. In the afore-said view of the matter, the Contempt Case is dismissed. No order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

NINALA JAYASURYA,J

November 13, 2025.
vasu