



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

[3331]

**THURSDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

IA 1 OF 2026

IN

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3539/2024

Between:

1. GEETHALA NARASIMHA REDDY, S/O NARAYANA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, R/O. D.NO. 1/17, THALLAPAKA
VILLAGE, RAJAMPETA MANDAL, SRI ANNAMAIAH DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. S PEER MUNI, Mandal Tahsildhar, Rajampet Annamaiah District.
Cause Title is amended as per Court order dated 24 01 2025 vide I
A No 1 of 2024 in CC No 3539 of 2024

...CONTEMNOR

Pleased to review the orders passed by this Hon'ble Court in the
above Contempt Case No.3539/2024, dt.07.08.2025 and set aside the
same by allowing the present interlocutory application and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P NARASIMHULU

Counsel for the Contemnor:

1. SUSHMA YAGANTI

The Court made the following:

ORDER

This petition is filed under Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC to review the order dated 07.08.2025 in C.C.No.3539 of 2024.

2. The above contempt case was filed complaining of the non-implementation of the order dated 16.04.2024 in W.P.No.6717 of 2024.

3. The petitioner filed the aforementioned writ petition to declare the action of the 4th respondent in not surveying land in an extent of Ac.1.50 cents in S.No.1263/3 of Thalapaka village, Rajampeta Mandal, Sri Annamayya District, as illegal and arbitrary. The said writ petition was disposed of on 16.04.2024.

4. In the contempt case, a reply affidavit was filed. In Paragraph-6 of the reply, it was stated that a survey was conducted on 18.06.2024, and the petitioner attended the said survey; however, refused to sign the attendance sheet. The proceedings of the Tahsildar, Rajampet Mandal *vide* R.Dis.No.A/321/2024, dated 23.09.2024, were annexed to the reply affidavit. Recording the same, the contempt case was closed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the averments in the reply affidavit in the contempt case are false and hence, the order dated 07.08.2025 in C.C.No.3539 of 2024 needs to be reviewed.

6. Unless the petitioner establishes or demonstrates the error apparent on the face of the record, review under Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC, is not maintainable. In the considered opinion of this Court, there

is no error apparent on the face of the record, and hence this petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed. No costs. However, this order will not preclude the petitioner from challenging the proceedings of the Tahsildar, Rajampet Mandal vide R.Dis.No.A/321/2024, dated 23.09.2024, before the appropriate forum.

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

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

PVD