



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

[3457]

FRIDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1763/2026

Between:

1. BANDI MARIYAMMA, , W/O. LATE BANDI YAKOBU, D/O. LATE GUJJULA ABRAHAM, AGED 72 YEARS, R/O. D.NO. 27-5-2/4, H/O TIPPANI MAEMMA, BESIDE CSI CHURCH, 32ND DIVISION, AMINAPETA, ELURU - 534006, ELURU DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. SRI A BHANU PRATAP, S/O. NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER, OCC COMMISSIONER OF ELURU MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, O/O. ELURU MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, ELURU, ELURU DISTRICT.
2. SRI D ALLEN GARDNER, S/O. NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER, OCC. TOWN PLANNING OFFICER, O/O. ELURU MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, ELURU, ELURU DISTRICT.

...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 hold the respondents/contemnors guilty of civil and criminal contempt under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, for their willfull disobedience of the order dated 21.07.2025 passed in W.P. No. 17059 of 2025 and Punish the contemnors appropriately by imposing suitable penalties, including imprisonment and/or fine, as deemed fit by the Honble Court, to uphold the majesty of law and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.V VIJAYA VARDHAN

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

Order:-

The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the respondents have willfully violated the orders of this Court dated 21.07.2025 in W.P.No.17059 of 2025.

2. This Court, while disposing of the writ petition, recorded the submissions of the learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 4 and 5 that a provisional notice was issued to respondent Nos.6 to 9 calling upon them to stall the construction. As the 6th respondent is reported to have refused to receive the notice, the same was affixed on the wall. Recording the said submissions, the writ petition was disposed of leaving it open for respondent Nos.4 and 5 to take necessary action after the statutory period of time granted to respondent Nos.6 to 9 was over.

3. It is alleged that, in spite of the said order, the respondents have not taken any action. However, no direction was issued by this Court and it was only left open for the respondents to take necessary action. The dispute between the petitioner and the unofficial respondents in the writ petition would have to be adjudicated before the appropriate forum.

4. On these considerations, this Court is of the considered view that the contempt case deserves to be closed.

5. Accordingly this contempt case is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

08.05.2026
PNS