



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

[3331]

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1592/2025

Between:

1.P SUNEEL KUMAR REDDY, S/O KRISHNA REDDY, AGED 45
YEARS OCC PRIVATE EMPLOYEE, R/O GOLDEN NAGAR,
KADAVALLUR VILLAGE AND MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.K KARTHIK, S/O NOT KNOWN JOINTCOLLECTOR, KAVALI, SPSR
NELLORE.

2.SMT SPOORTHY, W/O NOT KNOWN TAHSILDAR, KADAVALLUR
MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE 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 initiate the Contempt proceedings against the respondents and punish them suitably under Article 215 of Constitution of India R/w section 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for their deliberate and wilful disobedience of the order dt.25.07.2023 passed in Writ Petition No. 8841 of 2018 by His Lordship of the Honble Sri. Justice Subba Reddy Sathi and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.K SREEDHAR MURTHY

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.Y BALAJI

Date on which order was reserved	:	12.02.2026
Date on which order was pronounced	:	20.02.2026
Date on which the judgment was uploaded	:	23.02.2026

The Court made the following:**::ORDER ::**

The above contempt case was filed on 27.06.2025, complaining of violation of the order, dated 25.07.2023, passed in W.P.No.8841 of 2018.

2. The writ petition filed by the petitioner assailing the orders issued by the Joint Collector vide D.Dis.No.(E5) 4171/2014, dated 20.01.2018. The writ petition was allowed, and the operative portion of the order reads thus:

“In view of the above observation, this Court is of the opinion that the order of respondent No.2 vide D.Dis.No.(E5) 4171/2014, dated 20.01.2018 is liable to be set aside. Accordingly the order D.Dis.No.(E5) 4171/2014, dated 20.01.2018 is set aside. The matter is remanded back to the respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 shall consider the objections of the petitioner objectively and provide opportunity to the petitioner. Respondent No.4 also shall furnish copies of assignments made in favour of vendors of the petitioner, enabling the petitioner to raise appropriate grounds. Respondent No.2 shall also provide opportunity to respondent Nos.5 and 6 and pass appropriate orders strictly in accordance with law, within a period of eight (08) weeks.”

3. In the affidavit filed in support of the contempt case, it was contended that neither respondent No.1 nor respondent No.2 served a copy of the assignment despite the representation made by the petitioner on 07.02.2025 to furnish the assignment pattas, and thereby, respondent No.1 violated the order in the writ petition.

4. The above contempt case was initially listed on 09.07.2025 and was adjourned from time to time, at the request of learned counsel for the

respondents. On 05.12.2025, Sri Praveen, learned counsel representing Sri Y. Balaji, learned counsel for the respondents, submitted that the assignment record could not be traced out. Again, on 20.12.2025, Sri Rasheed, appearing on behalf of the respondents, submitted that the assignment record was not available either in the Collector's office or in the office of the Tahsildar. On 29.01.2026, this Court directed respondents 1 and 2 to appear before the Court, along with the entire record. Accordingly, both the respondents appeared before this Court on 12.02.2026.

5. Sri K. Karthik, respondent No.1, learned Joint Collector and Smt. Spoorthi, Tahsildar, respondent No.2 appeared before the Court on 12.02.2026. Respondent No.1 submitted that during the inquiry, the petitioner's vendor by name Dasu Ramanujamma produced a xerox copy of the D-form patta, said to have been assigned in her favour. However, the authority did not rely upon the said document, since the corresponding record is not available in the office of the Tahsildar, Kadavalur Mandal. He further submitted that against the order, dated 03.11.2024, passed vide D.DisNo.E1/656/2024, the petitioner filed a statutory revision before the Government, and the same is pending.

6. A copy of D-Form patta said to have been furnished by Smt. Dasu Ramanujamma is handed over to the learned counsel for the petitioner across the bar. Neither the assignment number nor the date is available in the copy of the assignment.

7. Sri Kasa Jagan Mohan Reddy, learned counsel representing Sri K. Sreedhar Murthy, learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that non-furnishing of assignment copies by respondent No.2 constitutes violation of the order of this Court and hence is liable to be punished.

8. Per contra, learned counsel for respondents submitted that respondent No.2 has not relied upon the assignment. Considering the other material, a speaking order was passed on 03.11.2024. The petitioner filed a revision against the said order, and the same is pending before the Government.

9. Whether the respondents violated the order dated 25.07.2023, in W.P.No.8841 of 2018?

10. While remitting the matter, this Court directed respondent No.1/contemnor to consider the objections of the petitioner objectively and provide an opportunity to the petitioner. This Court further directed respondent No.2/contemnor to furnish copies of assignments enabling the petitioner to raise appropriate grounds. In pursuance of the order dated 25.07.2023, as stated supra, respondent No.1 passed an order, dated 03.11.2024, assailing which, the petitioner filed a revision, which is pending before the Government. Of course, respondent No.1 without relying upon the assignment patta, passed an order which is subject matter of a revision before the Government. Respondent No.1 also furnished a copy of the assignment said to have been issued in favour of one of the vendors of the petitioner, by name Dasu Ramanujamma to the learned counsel for the petitioner, across the bar.

11. Since respondent No.1 passed a speaking order, this Court is of the considered opinion that respondents have not violated the order dated 25.07.2023, deliberately and intentionally.

12. In **J.S.Parihar v. Ganpat Duggar and Others**¹, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:

“....once there is an order passed by the Government on the basis of the directions issued by the Court, there arises a fresh cause of action to seek redressal in an appropriate forum. The preparation of the seniority list may be wrong or may be right or may or may not be in conformity with the directions. But that would be a fresh cause of action for the aggrieved party to avail of the opportunity of judicial review. But that cannot be considered to be the wilful violation of the order. After re-exercising the judicial review in contempt proceedings, afresh direction by the learned Single Judge cannot be given to redraw the seniority list. In other words, the learned Judge was exercising the jurisdiction to consider the matter on merits in the contempt proceedings. It would not be permissible under Section 12 of the Act. ...”

13. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any violation of the order dated 25.07.2023. Accordingly, this contempt case is dismissed. However, this order will not preclude the petitioner from raising additional grounds, if necessary, in the revision filed before the Government assailing the order, dated 03.11.2024, passed by respondent No.1, since the copy of the assignment was handed over to the learned counsel across the bar.

¹ (1996) 6 SCC 291

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

Date: 20.02.2026
IKN

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CONTEMPT CASE No.1592 of 2025

Date: 20.02.2026
IKN