



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

[3208]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 515/2020

Between:

1. BASU SIVA PRASAD, FATHER NAME S/O. LATE SITARAMA SWAMY AGE 33 ADDRESS AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCC AGRICULTURE, R/O. H. NO. 3-148-A, MANDAPAKALA, KODURU MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. TUNGALA VIJAYA MARUTHI RAMADAS, MARUTHI RAMDAS, THE MANDAL EDUCATION OFFICER, ADDRESS KODURU MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

2. SK LATHIEF PASHA, ADDRESS THE TAHASILDAR, KODURU MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH

3. VAKA MARIYA DASU, ADDRESS VILLAGE REVENUE OFFICER, MANDAPAKALA VILLAGE, KODURU MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

4. G SUDHA PRAVEEN, ADDRESS MANDAL PARISHAD DEVELOPMENT OFFICER, KODURUR MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

5. P RAMESH, ADDRESS STATION HOUSE OFFICER, POLICE STATION, KODURU MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...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 punish the respondents under section 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act for violating the order dated 30-04-2020 that subsequently extended for a period of six weeks on 08-05-2020 made in WP No. 8352 of 2020 and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2020

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 not to interfere or dispossess the petitioner from his land in an extent of 0-57 Cents in Sy No. 138/7, Mandapakala Village, Koduru Mandal, Krishna District, pending disposal of the above writ petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.N RAVI PRASAD

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.GP FOR REVENUE (AP)

2.GP FOR EDUCATION (AP)

The Court made the following:

1. This contempt case is filed against the respondents for willful disobedience of the orders dated 30.04.2020 passed by this Court in W.P.No.8352 of 2020.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this Court, in W.P.No.8352 of 2020, by order dated 30.04.2020, directed the respondents to maintain status quo as on that date with regard to the subject property. It is further submitted that, though the said writ petition was subsequently disposed of, the respondents, in violation of the interim order granted by this Court, interfered with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioner over the subject land. In support of the said allegation, the petitioner has placed reliance upon certain photographs filed along with the present contempt case.

3. This Court has carefully perused the photographs relied upon by the petitioner. However, the said photographs reveals that they do not disclose any date or time indicating when the alleged acts took place. Further, the photographs do not clearly establish the existence of any completed cattle shed, as asserted by the petitioner in the contempt affidavit. The material placed before this Court is not sufficient to conclusively demonstrate that the respondents had interfered with the possession of the petitioner in deliberate violation of the status quo order passed by this Court.

4. After receipt of notice in the contempt case, the 2nd respondent filed a detailed counter affidavit specifically denying the allegations made by the petitioner. It is stated therein that, as admitted by the petitioner himself in paragraph No.8 of the affidavit filed in support of the contempt case, the petitioner attempted to establish a cattle farming shed in land bearing Survey No.138/7 without obtaining any permission from the Gram Panchayat, Mandapakala. Such action is contrary to the provisions of Section 13 of the A.P. Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, and therefore the respondents acted strictly in accordance with law and not in violation of the orders passed by this Court.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions and examined the material available on record. In the present case, except the photographs, which themselves do not conclusively establish the alleged interference, no independent material has been placed before this Court to prove that the respondents intentionally violated the status quo order. In view of the photographs placed on record, the categorical denial made by the respondents, and the absence of any convincing material demonstrating deliberate interference by the respondents, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case of willful disobedience is made out against the respondents. Accordingly, this Court holds that there is no willful violation of the orders passed by this Court by the respondents. Therefore, the Contempt Case is closed. No order as to costs.

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

Date :21.04.2026
klk

JUSTICE D.RAMESH

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

C.C. No.515 of 2020

21.04.2026

klk